MASTER CARD

COLLEGIUM STI JOSEPH PHILADELPHIENSE 1851

DO NOT REMOVE THIS CARD
FROM THIS BOOK.
PENALTY OF $2.00 IF CARD IS
LOST OR MUTILATED.

REED, THOMAS B.
AUTHOR
012443
ACC. NO.
MODERN ELOQUEN
BOOK

DREXEL LIB
ST. JOSE

012443 PN 6121 .M7 VOL.11

MODERN ELOQUENCE
REED, THOMAS B.
A 771201 C 810813

Library
Saint Joseph's University
5600 City Avenue
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/moderneloquencev0000unse_w1g6


MODERN ELOQUENCE
LIBRARY OF
POLITICAL ORATORY
W.A.C.





EDMUND BURKE

Photogravure after a painting by Sir Joshua Reynolds

12413

MODERN ELOQUENCE

EDITOR-

THOMAS B. REED

JUSTIN McCARTHY · ROSSITER JOHNSON
ALBERT ELLERY BERGH

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

VOL. XI

POLITICAL ORATORY

A—BUR

JOHN D. MORRIS AND COMPANY
PHILADELPHIA

W.A.COWIE 1901

12443

ST. JOSEPH'S UNIVERSITY

3 9353 00316 1617

Copyright, 1903
By
JOHN D. MORRIS AND COMPANY

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION

Edward Everett Hale, Author of "The Man Without a Country."

John B. Gordon, Former United States Senator.

Nathan Haskell Dole, Associate Editor "International Library of Famous Literature."

James B. Pond, Manager Lecture Bureau; Author of "Eccentricities of Genius."

George McLean Harper, Professor of English Literature, Princeton University.

Lorenzo Sears, Professor of English Literature, Brown University.

Edwin M. Bacon, Former Editor "Boston Advertiser" and "Boston Post."

J. Walker McSpadden, Managing Editor "Édition Royale" of Balzac's Works.

F. Cunliffe Owen, Member Editorial Staff "New York Tribune."

Truman A. DeWeese, Member Editorial Staff "Chicago Times-Herald."

Champ Clark, Member of Congress from Missouri.

Marcus Benjamin, Editor, National Museum, Washington, D. C.

Clark Howell, Editor "Atlanta Constitution."

Epiphanius Wilson, Managing Editor.

INTRODUCTIONS AND SPECIAL ARTICLES BY

Thomas B. Reed,	Hamilton Wright Mabie,
Lorenzo Sears,	Jonathan P. Dolliver,
Champ Clark,	Edward Everett Hale,
George F. Hoar,	Charles W. Emerson,
Albert J. Beveridge,	Albert Ellery Bergh.

Note.—A large number of the most distinguished speakers of this country and Great Britain have selected their own best speeches for this Library. These speakers include Whitelaw Reid, William Jennings Bryan, Henry van Dyke, Henry M. Stanley, Newell Dwight Hillis, Joseph Jefferson, Sir Henry Irving, Arthur T. Hadley, John D. Long, David Starr Jordan, and many others of equal note.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

ORATORY, according to Aristotle, is an art subordinately included in that master art of politics or statesmanship, by which states are constituted, controlled, and developed. In its most general character, as implying the public expression of opinion and feeling in language at once fitting, clear, and ornate,* oratory, like poetry, is an eternal concomitant of human life, activity, and progress.

The public utterances in which the leaders of their fellow men have expressed their thoughts and aspirations, have uttered their warnings, and revealed their hopes, have proved themselves to be directors of popular enthusiasm, inspirers of self-sacrifice, and exemplars of national greatness, thus form a long and closely linked succession in the department of universal literature, in which the voice of to-day is often little more than the echo of some daring prophet, innovator, or reformer in the past. The first orators of Greece were poets, and while Solon the legislator corrected and enlightened his Athenian fellow countrymen in Homeric hexameters, Tyrtæus by his war songs roused to battle the less volatile minds of the Lacedæmonians. How near the present is to the past is proved by the fact that only in recent history do we read that the British government caused the verses of the Spartan poet to be translated from Greek into English and recited in the hearing of its red-coated squadrons, in the hope of infusing into them the spirit of those who fought and fell at Thermopylæ, twenty-five centuries before.

It is necessary that we should consider oratory, and especially political oratory, from this point of view, in order to fully understand its dignity and importance. We must

* Oratoris est apte, distincte, ornate, dicere.—Cic.

look upon this manifestation of human intellect as a stream which cleaves the landscape at our feet, but whose springs are only to be found in the dim and distant mountain heights. That current has flowed in unabated profusion through many tracts of history. Sometimes we see the foam and hear the thunder of the impetuous torrent in the indignant protestations of Demosthenes, when he points out to his laggard countrymen the threats and machinations of Philip. And again, upon the surface of the stream is mirrored the civilization of antique Rome, in the speeches of Cicero, but of Rome in her swift descent from republican liberty to Cæsarian absolutism.

But this river receives tributaries from every point of the compass, from the Congress of America, from the Parliament of England, from the blood-stained rostrum of the French convention, from the Cortes of Madrid, where the florid eloquence of Castelar pleads for the emancipation of the Porto Rican slaves. The mighty torrent widens its area as it echoes the voices of Chatham, Patrick Henry, and Daniel Webster. And to-day its current flows on still, less impetuously it may be, but with a calmness which is full of life and reality. The tones of our living orators are in harmony with the great ideals of the past, and the fountain of their inspiration, as they are prompted to speak of the great questions of the moment, is the same as that whose murmurs thrilled the contemporaries of Pericles, of Cicero, of Burke, of Mirabeau, of Webster, and of Abraham Lincoln.

And this leads us to point out the specific character of the present five volumes of "Political Oratory." In the previous volumes of "Modern Eloquence" room had been found for addresses whose main feature was speculative or literary. Even the lighter vein of eloquence is there exemplified in the genial and witty after-dinner speeches of such men as Clemens and Depew. The contents of these former volumes afford abundant evidence that amid the clash of politics and the absorbing pursuits of commercial life, leisure and cultivation still attract the most strenuous minds within the circle of a more placid atmosphere, where delicate fancy, historic allusion, and brilliant description might be permitted to form the staple of a public utter-

ance, which thus takes the shape of a lucubration, intended neither to threaten, to challenge, nor to rebuke, but merely to delight and interest—often to elevate—the mind of the auditors, by a succession of images lit up with moral enthusiasm, pathos, national sentiment, and the inspirations of an ideal life.

The compilation of the present five volumes of "Political Oratory" has a somewhat different object. The orations herein contained are practical and deal with actualities.

Here we see exhibited in the oration the springs and motives of the most stirring incidents in history.

We see to the heart of great events, because we see laid bare in eloquent utterances the hearts of those men who were the chief instigators and actors in the transaction of those events.

History is thus turned into a vivid drama of struggle and progress, alive with heroic figures, who speak the clear and deliberate logic of conviction, with the forecast of the statesman and the prescience of the seer, or shake the world like a storm or an earthquake, by their passionate expression of patriotism, love of liberty, or disinterested zeal for the emancipation of the downtrodden, for the diffusion of political privilege among the depressed and the degraded. In this survey we plainly discern the progress of historic evolution. We see upon what principles new nations may be built up and old nations renovated and restored. Not only is the power of speech, the application of language to its highest and widest purpose, exemplified in political orations, by which senates have been swayed, legislative assemblies directed, whole nations roused to enthusiasm for right and justice, or to fury against oppression, but we see how the general course of historic events is guided in ever-widening paths of liberty and enlightenment.

The ancient historians were well aware of this illuminative power of the oration, and it is in the many speeches which he introduces into his history that Thucydides has most plainly laid bare the policy of Athens and Lacedæmon. Thucydides was called by William Pitt the "statesman's handbook." Picturesque, clear, and interesting as are the Greek historian's descriptions of sieges and battles by

sea and land, we must read the orations which he puts into the mouth of men like Pericles, Alcibiades, and Cleon, before we can understand the passions that swayed the public assembly at Athens, and learn the underlying causes and motives of human events throughout all history.

The annals of our own country are unique in the completeness of what we may style their uninterrupted line of oratorical illustration. The United States fought their way to independence through the leadership of orators before they threw off the yoke of England at the point of the sword. The reign of great orators always precedes the reign of great soldiers. Since the time James Otis in colonial days denounced the iniquity of writs of assistance in words, at which, as John Adams says, "the child Independence was born," up to the present moment, the history of our country has been written in the speeches of her orators, and only what the voice has sown has the sword reaped. In fact it is impossible to learn aright the course of events on this continent, from the Boston Massacre to the Declaration of Independence, from the inauguration of George Washington to the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln, and thence onward to the battles of Santiago and Manila, and the annexation of Hawaii, without studying the speeches of those who have been called to guide the country by their eloquent counsels.

It would be a broad, but scarcely inaccurate generalization to state that such a collection as "Political Oratory" contains a history of liberty, or political freedom and independence. Prominent in this collection must stand forth the figure of Demosthenes, "the old man eloquent," who spoke for the liberties of Greece. To see how living is the influence of his orations we must remember that Brougham recommends all oratorical students to translate and retranslate the Greek speeches uttered against Philip; and, indeed, Brougham, in his greatest forensic effort, the defense of Queen Caroline, went to Demosthenes for his peroration, which is merely an imitation of the closing sentences in the "Oration on the Crown." The advice of Brougham is echoed by Senator Hoar in his scholarly introduction to our first volume. In the historical analysis which follows, it will be seen that liberty in some shape or other is the

staple subject of European as well as American oratory. During the palmy days of British oratory, the liberty of the press, the liberty of the slave, religious liberty, and the independence of Ireland, were subjects that inspired the eloquence of the foremost statesmen and agitators—viz., Curran, Wilberforce, O'Connell, Peel, and Grattan. Even in the British Parliament the voices of Burke and Chatham were raised to defend the liberties of colonial America. The frenzy of the French Revolution was roused by a spirit of vengeance for liberties long violated, as well as by a passionate desire for constructive measures calculated to insure to the people their natural rights. This frenzy is reflected in the utterances of iconoclasts like Marat, Danton, and Robespierre; while Mirabeau, the only constructive statesman of the revolutionary group, advocated the establishment of such a constitution as would set the individual liberty of every Frenchman on a permanent basis.

The constitutional history of the United States, from James Otis to Henry Ward Beecher, as represented by their speeches in our collection, is plainly the history of American liberty as safeguarded by American nationalism. This period culminated with Lincoln's abolition proclamation, and its indorsement by the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which came into effect in 1865. With the close of the war we see the establishment of the principle that every American citizen is first a citizen of the United States, and then a citizen of the state in which he resides; i.e., that the United States is a nation, national citizenship takes the precedence of state citizenship, and state sovereignty is implicitly declared contrary to the Constitution by the Fourteenth Amendment.

This outlines the battle-field of American oratory for more than a century, i.e., between the years 1761 and 1865. A careful study of the speeches in our collection will show this. The foundation of the republic was laid in the work of five great men, all represented by their speeches in the present work—viz., George Washington, the Sword of the Revolutionaries, and not only the Sword, but the Father of his Country, in wise counsel and example; James Madison, the principal framer of the Constitution; Alexander Hamilton, the author of the "Federalist," who "touched

the dead corpse of public credit, and it sprang upon its feet"; Thomas Jefferson, who taught what democracy meant, and swept away the last vestige that remained from the class and official convention of monarchical Europe; and Chief-Justice John Marshall, whose profound and judicious interpretation of the Constitution multiplied tenfold the force and expansiveness of that inimitable document.

During the middle period of American history the two burning questions were state sovereignty and slavery, and the anti-Federalist side of the discussion is well illustrated by John C. Calhoun's last speech. But as champion for the Union, that irresistible opponent of nullification, Daniel Webster, one of the greatest of English-speaking orators, ascended the tribune and answered Hayne, in a speech which has ever since been the watchword of American constitutionalism. This middle period of American oratory, which may be said to end with the election of Garfield, is notable for the national importance of the questions which became subjects of public discussion and debate, and the corresponding oratorical power of those engaged in the struggle—Webster, Calhoun, Thomas H. Benton, William Pinckney, Wendell Phillips, and John Quincy Adams. The last of the great orators of this time was Abraham Lincoln, whose mastery of the English language as a vehicle of sound statesmanship and inspiring counsel equaled that of the best among his contemporaries, and even predecessors.

The immense strides made in advancement by the American republic since the Civil War result from the country's release from those deep-seated and rankling differences which had rendered the war as inevitable as it was necessary, and up to the nomination of Abraham Lincoln had been obstacles and entanglements in the way of national development.

Since 1865, and the subsequent reconstruction period, an era of commercial preeminence has set in, and the orators of the United States have been chiefly occupied in questions connected with the country's wealth and material prosperity, with the tariff and the currency. This is illustrated by the orations in our collection. Bimetalism finds an advocate in D. B. Hill, and free silver is championed in the speeches of Richard P. Bland; while Bourke Cockran,

in his answer to William J. Bryan, maintains that to establish in this country a double standard of value in the currency would be contrary to sound finance and public honor. Tariff revision is discussed by Grover Cleveland in his message of 1887, and an exactly contrary position to that assumed by the Democratic President is taken by J. G. Blaine in his "A Century of Protection."

The end of the nineteenth century has witnessed some important changes in the attitude of the United States toward foreign territorialism. The Spanish war laid upon our country claims and responsibilities which are treated from divers points of view in the orations of Senator Hoar, J. P. Dolliver, and J. W. Bailey. The annexation of Hawaii, while opposed by Champ Clark in 1898, had been favored by Senator Davis in his speech delivered five years earlier. Minor matters of contemporary history furnish subjects for G. C. Perkins on the exclusion of the Chinese, and John Tyler Morgan on the Nicaragua Canal. These political orations may therefore be said to throw light on almost every subject of national importance which has occupied our statesmen throughout the history of the United States.

The contemporary history of the British Empire is also illustrated by the speeches of Lord Salisbury, Arthur J. Balfour, Lord Rosebery, and Lord Milner.

It may be objected that the collection of speeches which I here introduce is of very unequal as well as of very varied literary value. On the other hand, I contend that literary perfection is not the main requisite in a public address. What makes the great orator is thorough conviction and absolute sincerity of purpose. The first duty of the public speaker is the advocacy of truth as he sees and believes it to be. High moral qualities are essential to the production of true eloquence, whether the matter dealt with be great or small. The most powerful and the most influential speeches, ancient or modern, were those uttered in strict accordance with the needs of the hour, and uttered out of an overflowing heart excited by some future contingency dreaded or desired. A really great speech, however, requires a great occasion, and we must remember that great occasions are those which are accompanied with danger or

anxiety, and the great speech is called forth by prognostications of coming disaster, or the sense of falsehood to be unmasked, truth to be vindicated, and public salvation to be secured. There is some cause for national gratulation that the speeches that are here published as uttered by contemporary statesmen do not reach that pitch of sublimity which the orator never attains excepting under the consciousness of impending calamity, national ruin, or danger to some vital principle of personal or political life. The greatest speeches that were ever made were delivered when the orator foresaw with the unerring eye of divination the eclipse of his country's liberties—an event which, in spite of foreboding and philippic, most surely came to pass.

It is a cause for gratitude that these speeches of our later orators are calm, businesslike, and unclouded by anxiety or despair. What they lack in comparison with the burning utterances of Demosthenes, Patrick Henry, or Webster, they gain as testimonies and records of history. They bear on their face plain evidence that they were uttered in a day when tempests and cataclysms no longer threatened the stability of the state; when the country could continue its advance in calmness and strength toward the fulfilment of a wider destiny, in which she should not only become the market and financial center of the world, but should have power to hold out a helping hand for the deliverance of weaker peoples from the grasp of tyranny.

We venture to hope that the general and topical index appended to these five volumes will be of valuable service to those who desire to use the work intelligently, and to see many great epochs and incidents in the world's history illustrated by the power of contemporary eloquence. Especially useful such an index will prove to those who are studying the political history of the United States.

It will be noted that although "Political Oratory" belongs to the series entitled "Modern Eloquence," we have included in the selections a few specimens of ancient Greek and Roman oratory—so few, indeed, as by no means to alter the nature of the work, but rather to emphasize its essential character and aim. The models of the classic world are indeed of distinctly modern importance, as is indicated by

the advice of Lord Brougham and Senator Hoar, both of which high authorities direct the attention of the modern student of oratory to the study of Demosthenes and Cicero, without whose names a list of political orators would have palpably been incomplete.



ELOQUENCE

THE secret of eloquence eludes every attempt to discover it. Many writers, ancient and modern, have tried to tell the nature of it, or to instruct the ambitious youth in that which he covets as the art of all arts, the power of controlling the will of other men by the gift of speech. Cicero said the best things ever said about it. Perhaps Emerson has come next to him. Each was a great orator in his own way. But it is like poetry. When you have got the most comprehensive definition your attention is called to some example clearly outside your definition, which everybody will agree is genuine eloquence or genuine poetry. When you have studied carefully all the rules of the school and got by heart all the instruction of the professor, some untaught genius like Burns, or Patrick Henry, spontaneously, as a bird sings, eclipses all the trained masters.

A good style is an essential in an orator. It is acquired commonly by infinite labor and pains. To get it the scholar must have the benefit of the best masters and the severest criticism. He is told that to perfect himself he must study foreign tongues, must know how Cicero or Demosthenes handled a legal argument, or swayed a deliberative assembly. But when he has got through his study he finds himself beaten on his own ground by John Bright, or Erskine, or some Methodist or Hard-shell Baptist preacher from the backwoods.

For all that, it is true that training makes the orator. There will be no great orator, as there will be no great poet, with rare exceptions, who does not observe Horace's rule—

"Nocturna versate manu, versate diurna."

There have been natural orators who seem to have owed little to study. There have been a few famous speeches that were without premeditation. But the number of either is very small. Little that has been produced in that way keeps a permanent place in literature. In general, so far as eloquence is remembered, after the occasion that called it forth has gone by, or so far as anybody cares to read it afterward, it is like every other human accomplishment, the result of careful and laborious training. I have no doubt that the great natural orators of the world who have had no help from books or masters, and owe little to previous study, would all agree in lamenting their disadvantage and in envying their more fortunate rivals, whatever they may have done that was well done on the inspiration of an instant occasion. They would have done better if their faculties had been trained by study, and they would have done great things a hundred times as often. The great natural orators of the world are few in number, and each of them is remembered by one or by very few speeches only.

If the American youth aspires to this desirable accomplishment, which he is likely to desire beyond all others, he had better take Cicero or Quintilian, or the best writers or instructors in the art of oratory for his guide. He had better make careful preparation rather than trust himself to the inspiration of the sibyl, who will be quite unlikely to be at hand when most needed.

The longer I live, the more highly I have come to value the gift of eloquence. Indeed, I am not sure that it is not the single gift most to be coveted by man. To be a perfect and consummate orator is to possess the highest faculty given to man. He must be a great artist, and more. He must be a master of the great things that interest mankind. What he says ought to have as permanent a place in literature as the highest poetry. He must be able to play at will on the mighty organ, his audience, of which human souls are the keys. He must have knowledge, wit, wisdom, fancy, imagination, courage, nobleness, sincerity, grace, a heart of fire. He must himself respond to every emotion as an Eolian harp to the breeze. He must have—

> An eye that tears can on a sudden fill,
> And lips that smile before the tears are gone.

He must have a noble personal presence. His speech must be filled with music and possess its miraculous charm and spell—

> Which the posting winds recall,
> And suspend the river's fall.

He must have the quality which Burke manifested when Warren Hastings said, "I felt, as I listened to him, as if I were the most culpable being on earth"; and which made Philip say of Demosthenes, "Had I been there he would have persuaded me to take up arms against myself."

The orator has a present practical purpose to accomplish. If he fail in that he fails utterly and altogether. His object is to convince the understanding, to persuade the will, to set aflame the heart of the audience or those who read what he says. He speaks for a present occasion. Eloquence is the feather that tips his arrow. If he miss the mark he is a failure, although his sentences may survive everything else in the permanent literature of the language in which he speaks. What he says must not only accomplish the purpose of the hour, but should be fit to be preserved for all time, or he can have no place in literature, and but a small and ephemeral place in human memory.

The orator must know how so to utter his thought that it will stay. The poet and the orator have this in common. Each must so express and clothe his thought that it shall penetrate and take possession of the soul, and, having penetrated, must abide and stay. How this is done, who can tell? Carlyle defines poetry as a "sort of lilt." Cicero finds the secret of eloquence in a "lepos quidam celeritasque et brevitas," * to borrow his words in the "De Oratore." One living writer, who has a masterly gift of noble and stirring eloquence, finds it in "a certain collocation of consonants." Why it is that a change of a single word, or even of a single syllable, for any other which is an absolute synonym in sense, would ruin the best line in Lycidas, or injure terribly the noblest sentence of Webster, nobody knows. Curtis asks how Wendell Phillips did it, and answers his own question by asking how Mozart did it.

* Wit, animation, and terseness.

I have had great opportunities for hearing the best public speaking for the last fifty years. I have heard the great American orators at the pulpit and bar, in the Senate, and before political assemblies, and on literary occasions. I have heard Palmerston and Lord John Russell, and John Bright, and Gladstone, and Disraeli, each on great field days in the House of Commons, and I have heard Spurgeon and Guthrie in the pulpit. I have heard Webster, and Choate, and Kossuth, and Wendell Phillips, and James Walker. So possibly my experience and observation, although it came perhaps too late for my own advantage, may be worth something to others.

Every American youth, if he desire for any purpose to get influence over his countrymen in an honorable way, will seek to become a good public speaker. That power is essential to success at the bar or in the pulpit, and almost indispensable to success in public life. The rare men who have succeeded without it are the men who value it most.

The eye and the voice are the only and natural avenues by which one human soul can enter into and subdue another. When every other faculty of the orator is acquired, it sometimes almost seems as if voice were nine-tenths and everything else but one-tenth of the consummate orator. There are exceptions, of which Charles James Fox, the most famous debater that ever lived, is the best known. But it is impossible to overrate the importance to the orator's purpose of that matchless instrument, the human voice.

In managing the voice, the best tone and manner for public speaking is commonly that which the speaker falls into naturally when he is engaged in earnest conversation. Suppose you are sitting about a table with a dozen friends, and some subject is started in which you are deeply interested. You engage in an earnest and serious dialogue with one of them at the other end of the table. You are perfectly at ease. You forget yourself, you do not care in the least for your manner or tone of voice, but only for your thought. The tone you adopt then will ordinarily be the best tone for you in public speaking. You can, however, learn from teachers or friendly critics to avoid any harsh or disagreeable fashion of speech that you may have fallen into and that may be habitual to you in private conversation.

Next, never strain your vocal organs by attempting to fill spaces which are too large for you. Speak as loudly and distinctly as you can do easily, and let more distant portions of your audience go. You will find in that way very soon that your voice will increase in compass and power, and you will do better than by a habit of straining the voice beyond its natural capacity. Be careful to avoid falsetto, either in tone or style. Shun imitating the tricks of speech of other orators, even of famous and successful orators. These may do for them, but not for you. You will do no better in attempting to imitate the tricks of speech of other men in public speaking than in private speaking.

Never make a gesture for the sake of making one. I believe that most of the successful speakers whom I know would find it hard to tell you whether they themselves make gestures or not, they are so absolutely unconscious in the matter. But with gestures as with the voice, get teachers or friendly critics to point out to you any bad habit you may fall into. I think it would be well if our young public speakers, especially preachers, should have competent instructors and critics among their auditors after they enter their profession, to give them the benefit of such observation and appropriate counsel as may be suggested. If a Harvard professor of elocution could retain the responsibility for his pupils five or ten years after they get into active life, he would do a good deal more good than by his instruction to undergraduates.

So far I have been talking about mere manner. The matter and substance of the orator's speech must depend upon the moral and intellectual quality of the man. The great orator must be a man of absolute sincerity. Never advocate a cause in which you do not believe, or affect an emotion you do not feel. No skill or acting will cover up the want of earnestness. It is like the ointment of the hand which bewrayeth itself.

In my opinion, the two most important things that a young man can do to make himself a good public speaker are: (1) Constant and careful written translations from Latin or Greek into English. (2) Practise in a good debating society.

It has been said that all the great parliamentary orators of England are either men whom Lord North saw, or men who saw Lord North; that is, men who were conspicuous as public speakers in Lord North's youth, his contemporaries, and the men who saw him as an old man when they were young themselves. This would include Bolingbroke and would come down only to the year of Lord John Russell's birth. So we should have to add a few names, especially Gladstone, Disraeli, John Bright, and Palmerston. There is no great parliamentary orator in England since Gladstone died. A good many years ago I looked at the biographies of the men who belonged to that period who were famous as great orators in the Parliament or in court, to find, if I could, the secret of their power. With the exception of Lord Erskine and of John Bright, I believe every one of them trained himself by careful and constant translation from Latin or Greek, and frequented a good debating society in his youth.

Brougham trained himself for extemporaneous speaking in the Speculative Society, the great theater of debate for the University of Edinburgh. He also improved his English style by translations from the Greek, among which is his well-known version of the "Oration on the Crown."

Canning's attention while at Eton was strongly turned to extemporaneous speaking. They had a debating society in which the Marquis of Wellesley and Charles Earl Grey had been trained before him, in which they had all the forms of the House of Commons—Speaker, Treasury benches, and an Opposition. Canning also was disciplined by the habit of translation.

Curran practised declamation daily before the glass, reciting passages from Shakespeare and the best English orators. He frequented the debating societies which then abounded in London. He failed at first, and was ridiculed as "Orator Mum." But at last he surmounted every difficulty. It was said of him by a contemporary: "He turned his shrill and stumbling brogue into a flexible, sustained, and finely modulated voice; his action became free and forcible; he acquired perfect readiness in thinking on his legs; he put down every opponent by the mingled force of his argu-

ment and wit, and was at last crowned with the universal applause of the society, and invited by the president to an entertainment in their behalf." I am not sure that I have seen, on any good authority, that he was in the habit of writing translations from the Latin or Greek. But he studied them with great ardor, and undoubtedly adopted, among the methods of perfecting his English style, the custom of students of his day of translating from these languages.

Jeffrey joined the Speculative Society in Edinburgh in his youth. His biographer says that it did more for him than any other event in the whole course of his education.

Chatham, the greatest of English orators, if we may judge by the reports of his contemporaries, trained himself for public speaking by constant translations from Latin and Greek. The education of his son, the younger Pitt, is well known. His father compelled him to read Thucydides into English at sight, and to go over it again and again until he had got the best possible rendering of the Greek into English.

Macaulay belonged to the Cambridge Union, where, as in the society of the same name at Oxford, the great topics of the day were discussed by men, many of whom afterward became famous statesmen and debaters in the Commons.

Young Murray, afterward Lord Mansfield, translated Sallust and Horace with ease; learned great part of them by heart; could converse fluently in Latin; write Latin prose correctly and idiomatically, and was specially distinguished at Westminster for his declamations. He translated every oration of Cicero into English, and back again into Latin.

Fox can hardly be supposed to have practised much in debating societies, as he entered the House of Commons when he was nineteen years old. But it is quite probable that he was drilled by translations from Latin and Greek into English; and in the House of Commons he had in early youth the advantage of the best debating society in the world. It is said that he read Latin and Greek as easily as he read English. He himself said that he gained his skill at the expense of the House, for he had sometimes tasked himself during the entire session to speak on every question that came up, whether he was interested in it or not, as a means of exercising and training his faculties.

This is what made him, according to Burke, "rise by slow degrees to be the most brilliant and accomplished debater the world ever saw."

Sir Henry Bulwer's "Life of Palmerston" does not tell us whether he was trained by the habit of writing translations or in debating societies. But he was a very eager reader of the classics. There is little doubt, however, considering the habit of his contemporaries at Cambridge, and the fact that he was ambitious for public life and represented the University of Cambridge in Parliament just after he became twenty-one, that he belonged to a debating society, and that he was drilled in English composition by translating from the classics.

Gladstone was a famous debater in the Oxford Union, as is well known, and was undoubtedly in the habit of writing translations from Greek and Latin, of which he was always so passionately fond. He says in his paper on Arthur Hallam that the Eton Debating Club, known as the Society, supplied the British Empire with four prime ministers in fourscore years.

The value of the practise of translation from Latin or Greek into English, in getting command of good English style, can hardly be stated too strongly. The explanation is not hard to find. You have in these two languages, especially in Latin, the best instrument for the most precise and most perfect expression of thought. The Latin prose of Tacitus and Cicero, the verse of Virgil and Horace, are like a Greek statue or an Italian cameo. You have not only exquisite beauty, but also exquisite precision. You get the thought into your mind with the accuracy and precision of the words that express numbers in the multiplication table. Ten times one are ten, not ten and one one-millionth. Having got the idea into your mind with the precision, accuracy, and beauty of the Latin expression, you are to get its equivalent in English. Suppose you have knowledge of no language but your own. The thought comes to you in the mysterious way in which thoughts are born, and struggles for expression in apt words. If the phrase that occurs to you does not exactly fit the thought, you are almost certain, especially in speaking or rapid composition, to modify the thought to fit the

phrase. Your sentence commands you, not you the sentence. The extempore speaker never gets, or easily loses, the power of precise and accurate thinking or statement, and rarely attains that literary excellence which gives him immortality. But the conscientious translator has no such refuge. He is confronted by the inexorable original. He cannot evade or shirk. He must try and try and try again until he has got the exact thought expressed in the English equivalent. This is not enough. He must get an English expression, if the resources of the language will furnish it, which will equal, as near as may be, the dignity and beauty of the original. He must not give you pewter for silver, or pinchbeck for gold, or mica for diamond. This practise will soon give him ready command of the great riches of his noble English tongue. It will give a habitual nobility and beauty to his own style. The best word and phrase will come to him spontaneously when he speaks and thinks. The processes of thought itself will grow easier. The orator will get the affluence and abundance which characterize the great Italian artists of the Middle Ages, who astonish us by the amount and variety of their work as by its excellence. The value of translation is very different from that of original written composition. Cicero says:—

"Stilus optimus et praestantissimus dicendi effector ac magister."

Of this I am by no means sure. If you write rapidly you get the habit of careless composition. If you write slowly you get the habit of slow composition. Each of these is an injury to the style of the speaker. He cannot stop to correct or scratch out. Cicero himself in a later passage states his preference for translation. He says that at first he used to take a Latin author, Ennius or Gracchus, and get the meaning into his head, and then write it again. But he soon found that in that way, if he used again the very words of his author, he got no advantage, and if he used other language of his own, the author had already occupied the ground with the best expression, and he was left with the second best. So he gave up the practise and adopted instead that of translating from the Greek.

It is often said that if a speech read well it is not a good

speech. There may be some truth in this. The reader cannot, of course, get the impression which the speaker conveys by look, and tone, and gesture. He lacks that marvelous influence by which, in a great assembly, the emotion of every individual soul is multiplied by the emotion of every other. The reader can pause and dwell upon the thought. If there be a fallacy, he is not hurried away to something else before he can detect it. So also, his more careful and deliberate criticism will discover offenses of style and taste which pass unheeded in a speech when uttered. But still the great oratoric triumphs of literature and history stand the test of reading in the closet, as well as of hearing in the assembly. Would not Mark Antony's speech over the dead body of Cæsar, had it been uttered, have moved the Roman populace as it moves the spectator when the play is acted, or the solitary reader in his closet? Does not Lord Chatham's "I rejoice that America has resisted" read well? Do not Sheridan's great peroration in the impeachment of Warren Hastings and Burke's read well? Does not "Liberty and union, now and forever," read well? Does not "Give me liberty or give me death" read well? Does not Fisher Ames' speech for the treaty read well? Do not Everett's finest passages read well?

There are a few examples of men of great original genius who have risen to lofty oratory on some great occasion who had not the advantage of familiarity with any great authors. But they are not only few in number, but, as I said before, the occasions are few when they have risen to a great height. In general, the orator, whether at the bar or in the pulpit or in public life, who is to meet adequately the many demands upon his resources, must get familiar with the images and illustrations he wants, and the resources of a fitting diction, by soaking his mind in some great authors who will alike satisfy and stimulate the imagination and supply him with a lofty expression. Of these, I suppose the best are, by common consent, the Bible, Shakespeare, and Milton. To these I should myself by all means add Wordsworth. It is a maxim that the pupil who wishes to acquire a pure and simple style should give his days and nights to Addison. But there is a lack of strength and vigor in Addison, which, perhaps, prevents his being the best model for the

advocate in the court-house or the champion in a political debate. I should rather, for myself, recommend Robert South to the student. If the speaker, whose thought has weight and vigor in it, can say it as South would have said it, he may be quite sure that his weighty meaning will be expressed alike to the mind of the people and the apprehension of his antagonist.

CONTENTS

VOLUME XI

PAGE

ADAMS, JOHN
Inaugural Address. (*Delivered March 4, 1797*) . 1

ADAMS, JOHN QUINCY
The Jubilee of the Constitution. (*Before the New York Historical Society in 1839*) 8
On the Constitutional War Power over Slavery. (*In the House of Representatives, May 25, 1836*) . 17

ADAMS, SAMUEL
American Independence. (*In the State House, Philadelphia, August 1, 1776*) 21

ÆSCHINES
Against Crowning Demosthenes. (*Delivered in Athens, B.C. 330*) 38

AMES, FISHER
On the British Treaty. (*In the House of Representatives, April 28, 1796*) 43

BACON, AUGUSTUS OCTAVIUS
Character and Capacity of the Filipinos. (*In the United States Senate, 1901*) 77

BAILEY, JOSEPH WALDEN
The Porto Rico Tariff. (*In the United States Senate, Feb. 27, 1900*) 84

BALFOUR, ARTHUR JAMES
On the Boer War. (*Address to his Constituency at Manchester, Jan. 8, 1900*) 99

BANCROFT, GEORGE
The Political Career of Andrew Jackson. (*Delivered at Washington, June 27, 1845*) 110

PAGE

BAYARD, THOMAS FRANCIS
On the United States Army. (*Before the Phi Beta Kappa Society, at Harvard, June 28, 1877*) . 134

BEACONSFIELD, LORD
On Conservatism. (*At Manchester, April 3, 1872*) . 143

BEBEL, FERDINAND AUGUST
Socialism and Assassination. (*In the Reichstag, Nov. 2, 1898, on the Assassination of the Empress of Austria*) 159

BEECHER, HENRY WARD
Raising the Flag over Fort Sumter. (*Delivered April 14, 1865*) 180

BENJAMIN, JUDAH PHILIP
Education, the Foundation-Stone of Republican Government. (*Delivered before the Free Schools of New Orleans, 1845*) 200

BENTON, THOMAS HART
The Political Career of Andrew Jackson. (*In the United States Senate, Dec. 4, 1834*) . . 208

BEVERIDGE, ALBERT JEREMIAH
The March of the Flag. (*In Indianapolis, Sept. 16, 1898*) 224

BISMARCK, OTTO VON
War and Armaments in Europe. (*A Speech Made in the Reichstag, Feb. 6, 1888*) 244

BLAINE, JAMES GILLESPIE
A Century of Protection. (*In New York, Sept. 29, 1888*) 259

BLAND, RICHARD PARKS
Free Silver. (*In the House of Representatives, June 20, 1890*) 273

BONAPARTE, NAPOLEON
Address to His Army in the Italian Campaign. (*Delivered March, 1796*) 290
Proclamation to his Army. (*Dated May 1, 1796*) . 290

BONAPARTE, NAPOLEON (*Con'd*) PAGE
To his Soldiers, on Entering Milan. (*Made May 15, 1796*) 291
To his Soldiers, During the Siege of Mantua. (*Made Nov. 6, 1796*) 292
To his Soldiers, on the Conclusion of the Italian Campaign. (*Made March, 1797*) 292
To his Soldiers, After the War of the Third Coalition. (*Made Oct., 1805*) 293
To his Soldiers, on Beginning the Russian Campaign. (*In May, 1812*) 294
Farewell to the Old Guard. (*Uttered, April 20, 1814*) 295

BRECKINRIDGE, JOHN CABELL
Address Preceding Removal of Senate. (*In the United States Senate in 1858*) 296

BRIGHT, JOHN
The "Trent" Affair. (*In Rochdale, Dec. 4, 1861*) . 303

BROOKS, PRESTON SMITH
On the Sumner Assault. (*Delivered in the House of Representatives, July 14, 1856*) . . . 328

BROUGHAM, LORD
Against Pitt and War with America. (*In Liverpool, Oct. 8, 1812*) 333
Speech on Negro Emancipation. (*In the House of Lords, Feb. 20, 1838*) 338

BRYAN, WILLIAM JENNINGS
On the Income Tax. (*In the House of Representatives, Jan. 30, 1894*) 350

BURKE, EDMUND
Conciliation with America. (*Delivered in the House of Commons, March 22, 1775*) 368

BURLINGAME, ANSON
Massachusetts and Sumner. (*In the House of Representatives, June 21, 1856*) 429

ILLUSTRATIONS

VOLUME XI

FACING PAGE

EDMUND BURKE . . . . . *Frontispiece*
Photogravure after a painting by Sir Joshua Reynolds

JOHN ADAMS 6
Photogravure after a painting

JOSEPH WALDEN BAILEY 88
Photogravure after a photograph from life

GEORGE BANCROFT 110
Photogravure after a painting

LORD BEACONSFIELD 148
Photogravure after a painting

ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE 232
Photogravure after a photograph from life

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE 294
Photogravure after an engraving

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN 354
Photogravure after a photograph from life

JOHN ADAMS

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

[John Adams, second President of the United States, was born in Massachusetts in 1735. He graduated at Harvard and entered the profession of the law. The passage of the Stamp Act stirred him to revolt against the absolutist policy of the British government, and from that time he played a conspicuous part in the movement that resulted in independence. He was elected to the State Legislature, and in 1774 to the First Continental Congress. From the first he favored throwing off all allegiance to Great Britain, and he made a brilliant speech in support of Richard Henry Lee's motion for independence. When war with Great Britain came he played a conspicuous part in arranging its details on the patriotic side. He was sent as commissioner to France to enlist the sympathies of that country, and with Franklin and Jay he negotiated the preliminaries of peace with Great Britain. He was made minister to the last-named country when independence had been won, and when the national Constitution had been adopted he became Vice-President of the United States, filling the office eight years. When Washington retired John Adams was elected President. He died on the fiftieth anniversary of American independence, July 4, 1826, his political rival, Thomas Jefferson, expiring on the same day. The following address was delivered at his first inauguration as President of the United States in 1797.]

WHEN it was first perceived, in early times, that no middle course for America remained between unlimited submission to a foreign legislature and a total independence of its claims, men of reflection were less apprehensive of danger from the formidable power of fleets and armies they must determine to resist, than from those contests and dissensions which would certainly arise concerning the forms of government to be instituted over the whole, and over the parts, of this extensive country. Relying, however, on the purity of their intentions, the justice of their cause, and the integrity and intelligence of the people,

under an overruling Providence which had so signally protected this country from the first, the representatives of this nation, then consisting of little more than half its present numbers, not only broke to pieces the chains which were forging, and the rod of iron that was lifted up, but frankly cut asunder the ties which had bound them, and launched into an ocean of uncertainty.

The zeal and ardor of the people during the Revolutionary War, supplying the place of government, commanded a degree of order sufficient, at least, for the temporary preservation of society. The Confederation, which was early felt to be necessary, was prepared from the models of the Batavian and Helvetic confederacies, the only examples which remain, with any detail and precision, in history, and certainly the only ones which the people at large had ever considered. But, reflecting on the striking difference, in so many particulars, between this country and those where a courier may go from the seat of government to the frontier in a single day, it was then certainly foreseen by some, who assisted in Congress at the formation of it, that it could not be durable.

Negligence of its regulations, inattention to its recommendations, if not disobedience to its authority, not only in individuals, but in states, soon appeared with their melancholy consequences: universal languor, jealousies, rivalries of states, decline of navigation and commerce, discouragement of necessary manufactures, universal fall in the value of lands and their produce, contempt of public and private faith, loss of consideration and credit with foreign nations; and, at length, in discontents, animosities, combinations, partial conventions, and insurrection, threatening some great national calamity.

In this dangerous crisis the people of America were not abandoned by their usual good sense, presence of mind, resolution, or integrity. Measures were pursued to concert a plan to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty. The public disquisitions, discussions, and deliberations issued in the present happy constitution of government.

Employed in the service of my country abroad during

the whole course of these transactions, I first saw the Constitution of the United States in a foreign country. Irritated by no literary altercation, animated by no public debate, heated by no party animosity, I read it with great satisfaction, as the result of good heads, prompted by good hearts; as an experiment better adapted to the genius, character, situation, and relations of this nation and country than any which had ever been proposed or suggested. In its general principles and great outlines, it was conformable to such a system of government as I had ever most esteemed; and in some states, my own native state in particular, had contributed to establish. Claiming a right of suffrage in common with my fellow citizens in the adoption or rejection of a constitution which was to rule me and my posterity, as well as them and theirs, I did not hesitate to express my approbation of it on all occasions, in public and in private. It was not then nor has it been since any objection to it, in my mind, that the Executive and Senate were not more permanent. Nor have I entertained a thought of promoting any alteration in it but such as the people themselves, in the course of their experience, should see and feel to be necessary or expedient, and by their representatives in Congress and the state legislatures, according to the Constitution itself, adopt and ordain.

Returning to the bosom of my country, after a painful separation from it for ten years, I had the honor to be elected to a station under the new order of things; and I have repeatedly laid myself under the most serious obligations to support the Constitution. The operation of it has equaled the most sanguine expectations of its friends; and from a habitual attention to it, satisfaction in its administration, and delight in its effects upon the peace, order, prosperity, and happiness of the nation, I have acquired a habitual attachment to it and veneration for it.

What other form of government, indeed, can so well deserve our esteem and love?

There may be little solidity in an ancient idea that congregations of men into cities and nations are the most pleasing objects in the sight of superior intelligences; but this is very certain, that to a benevolent human mind there can be no spectacle presented by any nation more pleasing,

more noble, majestic, or august, than an assembly like that which has so often been seen in this and the other chamber of Congress—of a government in which the executive authority, as well as that of all the branches of the legislature, are exercised by citizens, selected at regular periods by their neighbors, to make and execute laws for the general good. Can anything essential, anything more than mere ornament and decoration, be added to this by robes or diamonds? Can authority be more amiable or respectable, when it descends from accidents or institutions established in remote antiquity, than when it springs fresh from the hearts and judgments of an honest and enlightened people? For it is the people only that are represented; it is their power and majesty that is reflected, and only for their good, in every legitimate government, under whatever form it may appear. The existence of such a government as ours for any length of time is a full proof of a general dissemination of knowledge and virtue throughout the whole body of the people. And what object of consideration more pleasing than this can be presented to the human mind? If national pride is ever justifiable or excusable, it is when it springs, not from power or riches, grandeur or glory, but from conviction of national innocence, information, and benevolence.

In the midst of these pleasing ideas, we should be unfaithful to ourselves if we should ever lose sight of the danger to our liberties—if anything partial or extraneous should infect the purity of our free, fair, virtuous, and independent elections. If an election is to be determined by a majority of a single vote, and that can be procured by a party through artifice or corruption, the government may be the choice of a party for its own ends, not of the nation for the national good. If that solitary suffrage can be obtained by foreign nations, by flattery or menaces, by fraud or violence, by terror, intrigue, or venality, the government may not be the choice of the American people, but of foreign nations. It may be foreign nations who govern us, and not we, the people, who govern ourselves; and candid men will acknowledge that, in such cases, choice would have little advantage to boast of over lot or chance.

Such is the amiable and interesting system of govern-

ment (and such are some of the abuses to which it may be exposed) which the people of America have exhibited to the admiration and anxiety of the wise and virtuous of all nations for eight years, under the administration of a citizen who, by a long course of great actions, regulated by prudence, justice, temperance, and fortitude, conducting a people inspired with the same virtues, and animated with the same ardent patriotism and love of liberty, to independence and peace, to increasing wealth and unexampled prosperity, has merited the gratitude of his fellow citizens, commanded the highest praises of foreign nations, and secured immortal glory with posterity.

In that retirement, which is his voluntary choice, may he long live to enjoy the delicious recollection of his services: the gratitude of mankind, the happy fruits of them to himself and the world which are daily increasing, and that splendid prospect of the future fortunes of his country which is opening from year to year. His name may be still a rampart, and the knowledge that he lives a bulwark, against all open or secret enemies of his country's peace.

This example has been recommended to the imitation of his successors, by both houses of Congress, and by the voice of the legislatures and the people, throughout the nation.

On this subject it might become me better to be silent, or to speak with diffidence; but as something may be expected, the occasion, I hope, will be admitted as an apology, if I venture to say, that if a preference, upon principle, of a free republican government, formed upon long and serious reflection, after a diligent and impartial inquiry after truth; if an attachment to the Constitution of the United States, and a conscientious determination to support it, until it shall be altered by the judgments and wishes of the people, expressed in the mode prescribed in it; if a respectful attention to the constitutions of the individual states, and a constant caution and delicacy toward the state governments; if an equal and impartial regard to the rights, interests, honor, and happiness of all the states of the Union, without preference or regard to a northern or southern, eastern or western position, their various political opinions on essential points, or their personal attachments;

if a love of virtuous men, of all parties and denominations; if a love of science and letters, and a wish to patronize every rational effort to encourage schools, colleges, universities, academies, and every institution for propagating knowledge, virtue, and religion among all classes of the people, not only for their benign influence on the happiness of life, in all its stages and classes, and of society in all its forms, but as the only means of preserving our Constitution from its natural enemies, the spirit of sophistry, the spirit of party, the spirit of intrigue, profligacy, and corruption, and the pestilence of foreign influence, which is the angel of destruction to elective governments; if a love of equal laws, of justice and humanity, in the interior administration; if an inclination to improve agriculture, commerce, and manufactures for necessity, convenience, and defense; if a spirit of equity and humanity toward the aboriginal nations of America, and a disposition to ameliorate their condition, by inclining them to be more friendly to us, and our citizens to be more friendly to them; if an inflexible determination to maintain peace and inviolable faith with all nations, and that system of neutrality and impartiality among the belligerent powers of Europe which has been adopted by the government, and so solemnly sanctioned by both houses of Congress, and applauded by the legislatures of the states and the public opinion, until it shall be otherwise ordained by Congress; if a personal esteem for the French nation, formed in a residence of seven years chiefly among them, and a sincere desire to preserve the friendship which has been so much for the honor and interest of both nations; if, while the conscious honor and integrity of the people of America, and the internal sentiment of their own power and energies must be preserved, an earnest endeavor to investigate every just cause, and remove every colorable pretense of complaint; if an intention to pursue, by amicable negotiation, a reparation for the injuries that have been committed on the commerce of our fellow citizens, by whatever nation; and if success cannot be obtained, to lay the facts before the legislature, that they may consider what further measures the honor and interest of the government and its constituents demand; if a resolution to do justice, as far as may depend upon me, at all

JOHN ADAMS

Photogravure after a painting



times and to all nations, and maintain peace, friendship, and benevolence with all the world; if an unshaken confidence in the honor, spirit, and resources of the American people, on which I have so often hazarded my all, and never been deceived; if elevated ideas of the high destinies of this country, and of my own duties toward it, founded on a knowledge of the moral principles and intellectual improvements of the people, deeply engraven on my mind in early life, and not obscured but exalted by experience and age; and with humble reverence I feel it my duty to add, if a veneration for the religion of a people, who profess and call themselves Christians, and a fixed resolution to consider a decent respect for Christianity among the best recommendations for the public service, can enable me, in any degree, to comply with your wishes, it shall be my strenuous endeavor that this sagacious injunction of the two houses shall not be without effect.

With this great example before me—with the sense and spirit, the faith and honor, the duty and interest of the same American people, pledged to support the Constitution of the United States, I entertain no doubt of its continuance in all its energy; and my mind is prepared, without hesitation, to lay myself under the most solemn obligations to support it to the utmost of my power.

And may that Being who is supreme over all, the patron of order, the fountain of justice, and the protector, in all ages of the world, of virtuous liberty, continue His blessing upon this nation and its government, and give it all possible success and duration, consistent with the ends of His providence.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS

THE JUBILEE OF THE CONSTITUTION

[John Quincy Adams, sixth President of the United States, was born at Braintree, Mass., July 11, 1767. He was the son of John Adams, the second President. He accompanied his father on his diplomatic missions to Europe, and began his education abroad. In 1785 he decided to return to the United States and enter Harvard. His attainments enabled him to enter the junior class and he took his degree in 1787. Four years later he was admitted to the bar. In 1794 Washington appointed him Minister to the Hague, from which place, in 1797, he was transferred to the court of Prussia. In 1801 he returned to America, and two years later was elected to the Senate from Massachusetts. In 1809 he was appointed Minister to Russia by President Madison, and was subsequently Minister to England, his time being engrossed by study, together with a keen observation of passing events, this being the period of the Napoleonic invasion. He remained abroad for eight years, when he resigned and returned home, thus closing the long though intermittent period of his residence in foreign countries. As secretary of state, to which office he was appointed in 1817, he became the originator of the "Monroe Doctrine," before the publication of the message that fathered upon Monroe this famous political canon. By the then established tradition that the head of the state department was in the line of succession to the presidency, Adams passed to that office in 1824. He died in 1848. The following oration was delivered before the New York Historical Society, 1839. The second speech was made in the House of Representatives, 1836.]

FELLOW CITIZENS and Brethren, Associates of the New York Historical Society: Would it be an unlicensed trespass of the imagination to conceive that on the night preceding the day of which you now commemorate the fiftieth anniversary—on the night preceding that thirtieth of April 1789, when from the balcony of your City Hall the chancellor of the State of New York administered to George Washington the solemn oath faithfully to

execute the office of President of the United States, and to the best of his ability to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States—that in the visions of the night the guardian angel of the Father of our Country had appeared before him, in the venerated form of his mother, and, to cheer and encourage him in the performance of the momentous and solemn duties that he was about to assume, had delivered to him a suit of celestial armor—a helmet, consisting of the principles of piety, of justice, of honor, of benevolence, with which from his earliest infancy he had hitherto walked through life, in the presence of all his brethren; a spear, studded with the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence; a sword, the same with which he had led the armies of his country through the war of freedom to the summit of the triumphal arch of independence; a corselet and cuishes of long experience and habitual intercourse in peace and war with the world of mankind, his contemporaries of the human race, in all their stages of civilization; and, last of all, the Constitution of the United States, a shield, embossed by heavenly hands with the future history of his country?

Yes, gentlemen, on that shield, the Constitution of the United States, was sculptured (by forms unseen, and in characters then invisible to mortal eye) the predestined and prophetic history of the one confederated people of the North American Union.

They had been the settlers of thirteen separate and distinct English colonies, along the margin of the shore of the North American continent; contiguously situated, but chartered by adventurers of characters variously diversified, including sectarians, religious and political, of all the classes which for the two preceding centuries had agitated and divided the people of the British islands—and with them were intermingled the descendants of Hollanders, Swedes, Germans, and French fugitives from the persecution of the revoker of the edict of Nantes.

In the bosoms of this people, thus heterogeneously composed, there was burning, kindled at different furnaces, but all furnaces of affliction, one clear, steady flame of liberty. Bold and daring enterprise, stubborn endurance of privation, unflinching intrepidity in facing danger, and inflexible

adherence to conscientious principle, had steeled to energetic and unyielding hardihood the characters of the primitive settlers of all these colonies. Since that time two or three generations of men had passed away, but they had increased and multiplied with unexampled rapidity; and the land itself had been the recent theater of a ferocious and bloody seven-years' war between the two most powerful and most civilized nations of Europe, contending for the possession of this continent.

Of that strife the victorious combatant had been Britain. She had conquered the provinces of France. She had expelled her rival totally from the continent, over which, bounding herself by the Mississippi, she was thenceforth to hold divided empire only with Spain. She had acquired undisputed control over the Indian tribes still tenanting the forests unexplored by the European man. She had established an uncontested monopoly of the commerce of all her colonies. But forgetting all the warnings of preceding ages —forgetting the lessons written in the blood of her own children, through centuries of departed time, she undertook to tax the people of the colonies without their consent.

Resistance, instantaneous, unconcerted, sympathetic, inflexible resistance, like an electric shock, startled and roused the people of all the English colonies on this continent.

This was the first signal of the North American Union. The struggle was for chartered rights—for English liberties —for the cause of Algernon Sidney and John Hampden— for trial by jury—the habeas corpus and magna charta.

But the English lawyers had decided that Parliament was omnipotent—and Parliament, in its omnipotence, instead of trial by jury and the habeas corpus, enacted admiralty courts in England to try Americans for offenses charged against them as committed in America; instead of the privileges of magna charta, nullified the charter itself of Massachusetts Bay, shut up the port of Boston, sent armies and navies to keep the peace and teach the colonies that John Hampden was a rebel and Algernon Sidney a traitor.

English liberties had failed them. From the omnipotence of Parliament the colonists appealed to the rights of man and the omnipotence of the God of Battles. Union!

Union! was the instinctive and simultaneous cry throughout the land. Their congress, assembled at Philadelphia, once—twice—had petitioned the king; had remonstrated to Parliament; had addressed the people of Britain, for the rights of Englishmen—in vain. Fleets and armies, the blood of Lexington, and the fires of Charlestown and Falmouth, had been the answer to petition, remonstrance, and address. . . .

The dissolution of allegiance to the British crown, the severance of the colonies from the British empire, and their actual existence as independent states, were definitely established in fact, by war and peace. The independence of each separate state had never been declared of right. It never existed in fact. Upon the principles of the Declaration of Independence, the dissolution of the ties of allegiance, the assumption of sovereign power, and the institution of civil government, are all acts of transcendent authority, which the people alone are competent to perform; and, accordingly, it is in the name and by the authority of the people, that two of these acts—the dissolution of allegiance, with the severance from the British empire, and the declaration of the united colonies as free and independent states—were performed by that instrument.

But there still remained the last and crowning act, which the people of the Union alone were competent to perform—the institution of civil government for that compound nation, the United States of America.

At this day it cannot but strike us as extraordinary that it does not appear to have occurred to any one member of that assembly, which had laid down in terms so clear, so explicit, so unequivocal, the foundation of all just government in the imprescriptible rights of man, and the transcendent sovereignty of the people, and who in those principles had set forth their only personal vindication from the charges of rebellion against their king, and of treason to their country, that their last crowning act was still to be performed upon the same principles. That is, the institution, by the people of the United States, of a civil government, to guard and protect and defend them all. On the contrary, that same assembly which issued the Declaration of Independence, instead of continuing to act in the name

and by the authority of the good people of the United States, had, immediately after the appointment of the committee to prepare the Declaration, appointed another committee, of one member from each colony, to prepare and digest the form of confederation to be entered into between the colonies.

That committee reported on the twelfth of July, eight days after the Declaration of Independence had been issued, a draft of articles of confederation between the colonies. This draft was prepared by John Dickinson, then a delegate from Pennsylvania, who voted against the Declaration of Independence, and never signed it, having been superseded by a new election of delegates from that state eight days after his draft was reported.

There was thus no congeniality of principle between the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation. The foundation of the former was a superintending Providence, the rights of man, and the constituent revolutionary power of the people. That of the latter was the sovereignty of organized power, and the independence of the separate or disunited states. The fabric of the Declaration and that of the Confederation were each consistent with its own foundation, but they could not form one consistent, symmetrical edifice. They were the productions of different minds and of adverse passions; one, ascending for the foundation of human government to the laws of nature and of God, written upon the heart of man; the other, resting upon the basis of human institutions, and prescriptive law, and colonial charter. The corner-stone of the one was right, that of the other was power. . . .

Where, then, did each state get the sovereignty, freedom, and independence which the Articles of Confederation declare it retains?—not from the whole people of the whole Union—not from the Declaration of Independence—not from the people of the state itself. It was assumed by agreement between the legislatures of the several states, and their delegates in Congress, without authority from or consultation of the people at all.

In the Declaration of Independence, the enacting and constituent party dispensing and delegating sovereign power is the whole people of the united colonies. The recipient

party, invested with power, is the united colonies, declared United States.

In the Articles of Confederation, this order of agency is inverted. Each state is the constituent and enacting party, and the united states in congress assembled, the recipient of delegated power—and that power delegated with such a penurious and carking hand that it had more the aspect of a revocation of the Declaration of Independence than an instrument to carry it into effect.

None of these indispensably necessary powers were ever conferred by the state legislatures upon the congress of the federation; and well was it that they never were. The system itself was radically defective. Its incurable disease was an apostasy from the principles of the Declaration of Independence. A substitution of separate state sovereignties, in the place of the constituent sovereignty of the people, was the basis of the confederate union.

In the Congress of the Confederation, the master minds of James Madison and Alexander Hamilton were constantly engaged through the closing years of the Revolutionary War and those of peace which immediately succeeded. That of John Jay was associated with them shortly after the peace, in the capacity of secretary to the Congress for foreign affairs. The incompetency of the Articles of Confederation for the management of the affairs of the Union at home and abroad was demonstrated to them by the painful and mortifying experience of every day. Washington, though in retirement, was brooding over the cruel injustice suffered by his associates in arms, the warriors of the Revolution; over the prostration of the public credit and the faith of the nation, in the neglect to provide for the payment even of the interest upon the public debt; over the disappointed hopes of the friends of freedom; in the language of the address from Congress to the states of the eighteenth of April 1783—"the pride and boast of America, that the rights for which she contended were the rights of human nature."

At his residence at Mount Vernon, in March 1785, the first idea was started of a revisal of the Articles of Confederation, by an organization, of means differing from that of a compact between the state legislatures and their own

delegates in Congress. A convention of delegates from the state legislatures, independent of the Congress itself, was the expedient which presented itself for effecting the purpose, and an augmentation of the powers of Congress for the regulation of commerce, as the object for which this assembly was to be convened. In January 1786 the proposal was made and adopted in the Legislature of Virginia, and communicated to the other state legislatures.

The convention was held at Annapolis, in September of that year. It was attended by delegates from only five of the central states, who, on comparing their restricted powers with the glaring and universally acknowledged defects of the confederation, reported only a recommendation for the assemblage of another convention of delegates to meet at Philadelphia, in May 1787, from all the states, and with enlarged powers.

The Constitution of the United States was the work of this convention. But in its construction the convention immediately perceived that they must retrace their steps, and fall back from a league of friendship between sovereign states to the constituent sovereignty of the people; from power to right—from the irresponsible despotism of state sovereignty to the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence. In that instrument, the right to institute and to alter governments among men was ascribed exclusively to the people—the ends of government were declared to be to secure the natural rights of man; and that when the government degenerates from the promotion to the destruction of that end, the right and the duty accrue to the people to dissolve this degenerate government and to institute another. The signers of the Declaration further averred that the one people of the united colonies were then precisely in that situation—with a government degenerated into tyranny, and called upon by the laws of nature and of nature's God to dissolve that government and to institute another. Then, in the name and by the authority of the good people of the colonies, they pronounced the dissolution of their allegiance to the king, and their eternal separation from the nation of Great Britain—and declared the united colonies independent states. And here as the representatives of the one people they had stopped. They

did not require the confirmation of this act, for the power to make the declaration had already been conferred upon them by the people, delegating the power, indeed, separately in the separate colonies, not by colonial authority, but by the spontaneous revolutionary movement of the people in them all.

From the day of that declaration, the constituent power of the people had never been called into action. A confederacy had been substituted in the place of a government, and state sovereignty had usurped the constituent sovereignty of the people.

The convention assembled at Philadelphia had themselves no direct authority from the people. Their authority was all derived from the state legislatures. But they had the Articles of Confederation before them, and they saw and felt the wretched condition into which they had brought the whole people, and that the Union itself was in the agonies of death. They soon perceived that the indispensably needed powers were such as no state government, no combination of them, was by the principles of the Declaration of Independence competent to bestow. They could emanate only from the people. A highly respectable portion of the assembly, still clinging to the confederacy of states, proposed, as a substitute for the Constitution, a mere revival of the Articles of Confederation, with a grant of additional powers to the Congress. Their plan was respectfully and thoroughly discussed, but the want of a government and of the sanction of the people to the delegation of powers happily prevailed. A constitution for the people, and the distribution of legislative, executive, and judicial powers was prepared. It announced itself as the work of the people themselves; and as this was unquestionably a power assumed by the convention, not delegated to them by the people, they religiously confined it to a simple power to propose, and carefully provided that it should be no more than a proposal until sanctioned by the confederation congress, by the state legislatures, and by the people of the several states, in conventions specially assembled, by authority of their legislatures, for the single purpose of examining and passing upon it.

And thus was consummated the work commenced by

the Declaration of Independence—a work in which the people of the North American Union, acting under the deepest sense of responsibility to the Supreme Ruler of the universe, had achieved the most transcendent act of power that social man in his mortal condition can perform —even that of dissolving the ties of allegiance by which he is bound to his country; of renouncing that country itself; of demolishing its government; of instituting another government; and of making for himself another country in its stead.

And on that day, of which you now commemorate the fiftieth anniversary—on that thirtieth day of April, 1789 —was this mighty revolution, not only in the affairs of our own country, but in the principles of government over civilized man, accomplished.

The revolution itself was a work of thirteen years—and had never been completed until that day. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are parts of one consistent whole, founded upon one and the same theory of government, then new in practise, though not as a theory, for it had been working itself into the mind of man for many ages, and had been specially expounded in the writings of Locke, though it had never before been adopted by a great nation in practise.

There are yet, even at this day, many speculative objections to this theory. Even in our own country there are still philosophers who deny the principles asserted in the Declaration as self-evident truths—who deny the natural equality and inalienable rights of man—who deny that the people are the only legitimate source of power—who deny that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. Neither your time, nor perhaps the cheerful nature of this occasion, permits me here to enter upon the examination of this anti-revolutionary theory, which arrays state sovereignty against the constituent sovereignty of the people, and distorts the Constitution of the United States into a league of friendship between confederate corporations. I speak to matters of fact. There is the Declaration of Independence, and there is the Constitution of the United States—let them speak for themselves. The grossly immoral and dishonest doctrine of despotic

state sovereignty, the exclusive judge of its own obligations, and responsible to no power on earth or in heaven for the violation of them, is not there. The Declaration says, It is not in me. The Constitution says, It is not in me.

ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL WAR POWER OVER SLAVERY

There are, then, Mr. Chairman, in the authority of Congress and of the Executive, two classes of powers, altogether different in their nature, and often incompatible with each other—the war power and the peace power. The peace power is limited by regulations and restricted by provisions prescribed within the Constitution itself. The war power is limited only by the laws and usages of nations. The power is tremendous; it is strictly constitutional; but it breaks down every barrier so anxiously erected for the protection of liberty, of property, and of life. This, sir, is the power which authorizes you to pass the resolution now before you, and, in my opinion, there is no other.

And this, sir, is the reason which I was not permitted to give this morning for voting with only eight associates against the first resolution reported by the Committee on the Abolition of Petitions; not one word of discussion had been permitted on either of those resolutions. When called to vote upon the first of them, I asked only five minutes of the time of the House to prove that it was utterly unfounded. It was not the pleasure of the House to grant me those five minutes. Sir, I must say that, in all the proceedings of the House upon that report, from the previous question, moved and inflexibly persisted in by a member of the committee itself which reported the resolutions [Mr. Owens, of Georgia], to the refusal of the speaker, sustained by the majority of the House, to permit the other gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Glascock] to record upon the journal his reasons for asking to be excused from voting on that same resolution, the freedom of debate has been stifled in this House to a degree far beyond anything that ever hap-

pened since the existence of the Constitution of the United States; nor is it a consolatory reflection to me how intensely we have been made to feel, in the process of that operation, that the Speaker of this House is a slaveholder. And, sir, as I was not then permitted to assign my reasons for voting against that resolution before I gave the vote, I rejoice that the reason for which I shall vote for the resolution now before the committee is identically the same with that for which I voted against that.

[Mr. Adams at this, and at many other passages of this speech, was interrupted by calls to order. The chairman of the committee, Mr. A. H. Shepperd, of North Carolina, in every instance decided that he was not out of order, but at this passage intimated that he was approaching very close upon its borders; upon which Mr. Adams said: "Then I am to understand, sir, that I am yet within the bounds of order, but that I may transcend them hereafter."]

And now, sir, am I to be disconcerted and silenced, or admonished by the chair that I am approaching to irrelevant matter, which may warrant him to arrest me in my argument, because I say that the reason for which I shall vote for the resolution now before the committee, levying a heavy contribution upon the property of my constituents, is identically the same with the reason for which I voted against the resolution reported by the slavery committee, that Congress have no authority to interfere, in any way, with slavery in any of the states of this Union? Sir, I was not allowed to give my reasons for that vote, and a majority of my constituents, perhaps proportionately as large as that of this House in favor of that resolution, may and probably will disapprove my vote against, unless my reasons for so voting should be explained to them. I asked but five minutes of the House to give those reasons, and was refused. I shall, therefore, take the liberty to give them now, as they are strictly applicable to the measure now before the committee, and are my only justification for voting in favor of this resolution.

I return, then, to my first position, that there are two classes of powers vested by the Constitution of the United States in their Congress and Executive government: the powers to be exercised in the time of peace, and the powers

incidental to war. That the powers of peace are limited by provisions within the body of the Constitution itself, but that the powers of war are limited and regulated only by the laws and usages of nations. There are, indeed, powers of peace conferred upon Congress, which also come within the scope and jurisdiction of the laws of nations, such as the negotiation of treaties of amity and commerce, the interchange of public ministers and consuls, and all the personal and social intercourse between the individual inhabitants of the United States and foreign nations, and the Indian tribes, which require the interposition of any law. But the powers of war are all regulated by the laws of nations, and are subject to no other limitation. It is by this power that I am justified in voting the money of my constituents for the immediate relief of their fellow citizens suffering with extreme necessity even for subsistence, by the direct consequence of an Indian war. Upon the same principle, your consuls in foreign ports are authorized to provide for the subsistence of seamen in distress, and even for their passage to their own country.

And it was upon that same principle that I voted against the resolution reported by the slavery committee, "That Congress possess no constitutional authority to interfere, in any way, with the institution of slavery in any of the states of this confederacy," to which resolution most of those with whom I usually concur, and even my own colleagues in this House, gave their assent. I do not admit that there is even among the peace powers of Congress no such authority; but in war there are many ways by which Congress not only have the authority, but is bound to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states. The existing law prohibiting the importation of slaves into the United States from foreign countries is itself an interference with the institution of slavery in the states. It was so considered by the founders of the Constitution of the United States, in which it was stipulated that Congress should not interfere, in that way, with the institution, prior to the year 1808.

During the late war with Great Britain the military and naval commanders of that nation issued proclamations inviting the slaves to repair to their standards, with promises of freedom and of settlement in some of the British colonial

establishments. This, surely, was an interference with the institution of slavery in the states. By the treaty of peace, Great Britain stipulated to evacuate all the forts and places in the United States, without carrying away any slaves. If the Government of the United States had no authority to interfere, in any way, with the institution of slavery in the states, it would not have had the authority to require this stipulation. It is well known that this engagement was not fulfilled by the British naval and military commanders; that, on the contrary, they did carry away all the slaves whom they had induced to join them, and that the British government inflexibly refused to restore any of them to their masters; that a claim of indemnity was consequently instituted in behalf of the owners of the slaves, and was successfully maintained. All that series of transactions was an interference by Congress with the institution of slavery in the states in one way—in the way of protection and support. It was by the institution of slavery alone that the restitution of slaves enticed by proclamations into the British service could be claimed as property. But for the institution of slavery, the British commanders could neither have allured them to their standard, nor restored them otherwise than as liberated prisoners of war. But for the institution of slavery, there could have been no stipulation that they should not be carried away as property, nor any claim of indemnity for the violation of that engagement.

But the war power of Congress over the institution of slavery in the states is yet far more extensive. Suppose the case of a servile war, complicated, as to some extent it is even now, with an Indian war; suppose Congress were called to raise armies, to supply money from the whole Union, to suppress a servile insurrection: would it have no authority to interfere with the institution of slavery? The issue of a servile war may be disastrous. By war the slave may emancipate himself; it may become necessary for the master to recognize his emancipation by a treaty of peace; can it for an instant be pretended that Congress, in such a contingency, would have no authority to interfere with the institution of slavery, in any way, in the states? Why, it would be equivalent to saying that Congress has no constitutional authority to make peace.

SAMUEL ADAMS

AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE

[Samuel Adams, American patriot, was born at Boston, Mass., September 27, 1722. He was educated in the Latin School and at Harvard College, taking his degree in 1740. Three years later, in being advanced to the degree of master of arts, he read a thesis defending the lawfulness of resistance to magistrates, in the presence of the royal governor and council. After failing in business he devoted himself to politics, and in 1765 he was elected a member of the General Assembly of Massachusetts, and shortly after chosen clerk of the House. In 1767 the plan to defeat the operation of the act imposing duties proceeded from him, and in 1770, after the Boston massacre of the fifth of March, his forceful speech in the Assembly compelled Governor Hutchinson to remove both of the British regiments then quartered in the city. Largely through his manipulating skill the Massachusetts Assembly passed the vote to elect delegates, equipped with supplies, to a general congress to be held in Philadelphia to consult concerning the safety of America. Being of the number appointed, he thus became a member of the first, as well as later of the second, Continental Congress. The purpose of declaring for independence was absent from the minds of the majority of these early legislators; but Mr. Adams, though politic in the expression of his convictions, had long held no other course to be feasible. He remained a member of the Continental Congress during the progress of the Revolution. He was a member of the Massachusetts convention of 1788, which ratified the Constitution. He died in Boston, October 2, 1803. His stirring speech on "American Independence" was delivered in Philadelphia, at the State House, August 1, 1776, a month after the signing of the Declaration of Independence.]

I WOULD gladly have declined an honor to which I find myself unequal. I have not the calmness and impartiality which the infinite importance of this occasion demands. I will not deny the charge of my enemies, that resentment for the accumulated injuries of our country, and an ardor for her glory rising to enthusiasm, may de-

prive me of that accuracy of judgment and expression which men of cooler passions may possess. Let me beseech you, then, to hear me with caution, to examine your prejudice, and to correct the mistakes into which I may be hurried by my zeal.

Truth loves an appeal to the common sense of mankind. Your unperverted understandings can best determine on subjects of a practical nature. The positions and plans which are said to be above the comprehension of the multitude may be always suspected to be visionary and fruitless. He who made all men hath made the truths necessary to human happiness obvious to all.

Our forefathers threw off the yoke of Popery in religion; for you is reserved the honor of leveling the popery of politics. They opened the Bible to all, and maintained the capacity of every man to judge for himself in religion. Are we sufficient for the comprehension of the sublimest spiritual truths, and unequal to material and temporal ones?

Heaven hath trusted us with the management of things for eternity, and man denies us ability to judge of the present, or to know from our feelings the experience that will make us happy. "You can discern," they say, "objects distant and remote, but cannot perceive those within your grasp. Let us have the distribution of present goods, and cut out and manage as you please the interests of futurity." This day, I trust, the reign of political protestantism will commence. We have explored the temple of royalty, and found that the idol we have bowed down to has eyes which see not, ears that hear not our prayers, and a heart like the nether millstone. We have this day restored the Sovereign to whom alone men ought to be obedient. He reigns in heaven, and with a propitious eye beholds His subjects assuming that freedom of thought and dignity of self-direction which He bestowed on them. From the rising to the setting sun may His kingdom come!

Having been a slave to the influence of opinion early acquired, and distinctions generally received, I am ever inclined not to despise but pity those who are yet in darkness. But to the eye of reason what can be more clear than that all men have an equal right to happiness? Nature made no other distinction than that of higher and lower

degrees of power of mind and body. But what mysterious distribution of character has the craft of statesmen, more fatal than priestcraft, introduced?

According to their doctrine, the offspring of perhaps the lewd embraces of a successful invader shall, from generation to generation, arrogate the right of lavishing on their pleasures a proportion of the fruits of the earth more than sufficient to supply the wants of thousands of their fellow creatures; claim authority to manage them like beasts of burden, and, without superior industry, capacity, or virtue, nay, though disgraceful to humanity, by their ignorance, intemperance, and brutality, shall be deemed best calculated to frame laws and to consult for the welfare of society.

Were the talents and virtues which Heaven has bestowed on men given merely to make them more obedient drudges, to be sacrificed to the follies and ambition of a few? Or, were not the noble gifts so equally dispensed with a divine purpose and law, that they should as nearly as possible be equally exerted, and the blessings of Providence be equally enjoyed by all? Away, then, with those absurd systems which to gratify the pride of a few debase the greater part of our species below the order of men. What an affront to the King of the Universe to maintain that the happiness of a monster sunk in debauchery and spreading desolation and murder among men, of a Caligula, a Nero, or a Charles, is more precious in His sight than that of millions of His suppliant creatures, who do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with their God! No, in the judgment of Heaven there is no other superiority among men than a superiority in wisdom and virtue. And can we have a safer model in forming ours? The Deity, then, has not given any order or family of men authority over others; and if any men have given it, they only could give it for themselves. Our forefathers, 'tis said, consented to be subject to the laws of Great Britain. I will not, at present, dispute it, nor mark out the limits and conditions of their submission; but will it be denied that they contracted to pay obedience and to be under the control of Great Britain because it appeared to them most beneficial in their then present circumstances and situations? We, my countrymen, have the same right to consult and provide for our happiness which they had to

promote theirs. If they had a view to posterity in their contracts, it must have been to advance the felicity of their descendants. If they erred in their expectations and prospects, we can never be condemned for a conduct which they would have recommended had they foreseen our present condition.

Ye darkeners of counsel, who would make the property, lives, and religion of millions depend on the evasive interpretations of musty parchments; who would send us to antiquated charters of uncertain and contradictory meaning, to prove that the present generation are not bound to be victims to cruel and unforgiving despotism, tell us whether our pious and generous ancestors bequeathed to us the miserable privilege of having the rewards of our honesty, industry, the fruits of those fields which they purchased and bled for, wrested from us at the will of men over whom we have no check. Did they contract for us that, with folded arms, we should expect that justice and mercy from brutal and inflamed invaders which have been denied to our supplications at the foot of the throne? Were we to hear our character as a people ridiculed with indifference? Did they promise for us that our meekness and patience should be insulted; our coasts harassed, our towns demolished and plundered, and our wives and offspring exposed to nakedness, hunger, and death, without our feeling the resentment of men, and exerting those powers of self-preservation which God has given us? No man had once a greater veneration for Englishmen than I entertained. They were dear to me as branches of the same parental trunk, and partakers of the same religion and laws; I still view with respect the remains of the constitution as I would a lifeless body, which had once been animated by a great and heroic soul. But when I am aroused by the din of arms; when I behold legions of foreign assassins, paid by Englishmen to imbrue their hands in our blood; when I tread over the uncoffined bodies of my countrymen, neighbors, and friends; when I see the locks of a venerable father torn by savage hands, and a feeble mother clasping her infants to her bosom, and on her knees imploring their lives from her own slaves, whom Englishmen have allured to treachery and murder; when I behold my country, once

the seat of industry, peace, and plenty, changed by Englishmen to a theater of blood and misery, Heaven forgive me, if I cannot root out those passions which it has implanted in my bosom, and detest submission to a people who have either ceased to be human, or have not virtue enough to feel their own wretchedness and servitude!

Men who content themselves with the semblance of truth and a display of words talk much of our obligations to Great Britain for protection. Had she a single eye to our advantage? A nation of shopkeepers are very seldom so disinterested. Let us not be so amused with words; the extension of her commerce was her object. When she defended our coasts, she fought for her customers, and convoyed our ships loaded with wealth, which we had acquired for her by our industry. She has treated us as beasts of burden, whom the lordly masters cherish that they may carry a greater load. Let us inquire also against whom she has protected us? Against her own enemies with whom we had no quarrel, or only on her account, and against whom we always readily exerted our wealth and strength when they were required. Were these colonies backward in giving assistance to Great Britain, when they were called upon in 1741 to aid the expedition against Carthagena? They at that time sent three thousand men to join the British army, although the war commenced without their consent. But the last war, 'tis said, was purely American. This is a vulgar error, which, like many others, has gained credit by being confidently repeated. The dispute between the courts of Great Britain and France related to the limits of Canada and Nova Scotia. The controverted territory was not claimed by any in the colonies, but by the Crown of Great Britain. It was therefore their own quarrel. The infringement of a right which England had, by the treaty of Utrecht, of trading in the Indian country of Ohio, was another cause of the war. The French seized large quantities of British manufacture and took possession of a fort which a company of British merchants and factors had erected for the security of their commerce. The war was therefore waged in defense of lands claimed by the crown, and for the protection of British property. The French at that time had no quarrel with America, and, as appears by

letters sent from their commander-in-chief to some of the colonies, wished to remain in peace with us. The part, therefore, which we then took, and the miseries to which we exposed ourselves, ought to be charged to our affection to Britain. These colonies granted more than their proportion to the support of the war. They raised, clothed, and maintained nearly twenty-five thousand men, and so sensible were the people of England of our great exertions, that a message was annually sent to the House of Commons purporting, "that his majesty, being highly satisfied with the zeal and vigor with which his faithful subjects in North America had exerted themselves in defense of his majesty's just rights and possessions, recommend it to the House to take the same into consideration, and enable him to give them a proper compensation."

But what purpose can arguments of this kind answer? Did the protection we received annul our rights as men, and lay us under an obligation of being miserable?

Who among you, my countrymen, that is a father, would claim authority to make your child a slave because you had nourished him in infancy?

'Tis a strange species of generosity which requires a return infinitely more valuable than anything it could have bestowed; that demands as a reward for a defense of our property a surrender of those inestimable privileges, to the arbitrary will of vindictive tyrants, which alone give value to that very property.

Political rights and public happiness are different words for the same idea. They who wander into metaphysical labyrinths, or have recourse to original contracts, to determine the rights of men, either impose on themselves or mean to delude others. Public utility is the only certain criterion. It is a test which brings disputes to a speedy decision, and makes its appeal to the feelings of mankind. The force of truth has obliged men to use arguments drawn from this principle who were combating it in practise and speculation. The advocates for a despotic government and non-resistance to the magistrate employ reasons in favor of their systems drawn from a consideration of their tendency to promote public happiness.

The Author of Nature directs all His operations to the

production of the greatest good, and has made human virtue to consist in a disposition and conduct which tends to the common felicity of His creatures. An abridgment of the natural freedom of men, by the institutions of political societies, is vindicable only on this footing. How absurd, then, is it to draw arguments from the nature of civil society for the annihilation of those very ends which society was intended to procure! Men associate for their mutual advantage. Hence, the good and happiness of the members, that is, the majority of the members, of any state, is the great standard by which everything relating to that state must finally be determined; and though it may be supposed that a body of people may be bound by a voluntary resignation (which they have been so infatuated as to make) of all their interests to a single person, or to a few, it can never be conceived that the resignation is obligatory to their posterity; because it is manifestly contrary to the good of the whole that it should be so.

These are the sentiments of the wisest and most virtuous champions of freedom. Attend to a portion on this subject from a book in our defense, written, I had almost said, by the pen of inspiration. "I lay no stress," says he, "on charters; they derive their rights from a higher source. It is inconsistent with common sense to imagine that any people would ever think of settling in a distant country on any such condition, or that the people from whom they withdrew should forever be masters of their property, and have power to subject them to any modes of government they pleased. And had there been expressed stipulations to this purpose in all the charters of the colonies, they would, in my opinion, be no more bound by them than if it had been stipulated with them that they should go naked, or expose themselves to the incursions of wolves and tigers."

Such are the opinions of every virtuous and enlightened patriot in Great Britain. Their petition to Heaven is, That there may be one free country left upon earth, to which they may fly when venality, luxury, and vice shall have completed the ruin of liberty there.

Courage, then, my countrymen! Our contest is not only whether we ourselves shall be free, but whether there shall

be left to mankind an asylum on earth for civil and religious liberty. Dismissing, therefore, the justice of our cause, as incontestable, the only question is, What is best for us to pursue in our present circumstances?

The doctrine of dependence on Great Britain is, I believe, generally exploded; but as I would attend to the honest weakness of the simplest of men, you will pardon me if I offer a few words on that subject.

We are now on this continent, to the astonishment of the world, three millions of souls united in one cause. We have large armies, well disciplined and appointed, with commanders inferior to none in military skill, and superior in activity and zeal. We are furnished with arsenals and stores beyond our most sanguine expectations, and foreign nations are waiting to crown our success by their alliances. There are instances of, I would say, an almost astonishing Providence in our favor; our success has staggered our enemies, and almost given faith to infidels; so we may truly say it is not our own arm which has saved us.

The hand of Heaven appears to have led us on to be, perhaps, humble instruments and means in the great providential dispensation which is completing. We have fled from the political Sodom; let us not look back, lest we perish and become a monument of infamy and derision to the world. For can we ever expect more unanimity and a better preparation for defense; more infatuation of counsel among our enemies, and more valor and zeal among ourselves? The same force and resistance which are sufficient to procure us our liberties will secure us a glorious independence and support us in the dignity of free, imperial states. We cannot suppose that our opposition has made a corrupt and dissipated nation more friendly to America, or created in them a greater respect for the rights of mankind. We can therefore expect a restoration and establishment of our privileges, and a compensation for the injuries we have received, from their want of power, from their fears, and not from their virtues. The unanimity and valor which will effect an honorable peace can render a future contest for our liberties unnecessary. He who has strength to chain down the wolf is a madman if he let him loose without drawing his teeth and paring his nails.

From the day on which an accommodation takes place between England and America, on any other terms than as independent states, I shall date the ruin of this country. A politic minister will study to lull us into security, by granting us the full extent of our petitions. The warm sunshine of influence would melt down the virtue which the violence of the storm rendered more firm and unyielding. In a state of tranquillity, wealth, and luxury, our descendants would forget the arts of war and the noble activity and zeal which made their ancestors invincible. Every art of corruption would be employed to loosen the bond of union which renders our resistance formidable. When the spirit of liberty which now animates our hearts and gives success to our arms is extinct, our numbers will accelerate our ruin and render us easier victims to tyranny. Ye abandoned minions of an infatuated ministry, if peradventure any should yet remain among us, remember that a Warren and a Montgomery are numbered among the dead. Contemplate the mangled bodies of your countrymen, and then say, What should be the reward of such sacrifices? Bid us and our posterity bow the knee, supplicate the friendship, and plow, and sow, and reap, to glut the avarice of the men who have let loose on us the dogs of war to riot in our blood and hunt us from the face of the earth? If ye love wealth better than liberty, the tranquillity of servitude than the animating contest of freedom, go from us in peace. We ask not your counsels or arms. Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you. May your chains sit lightly upon you, and may posterity forget that ye were our countrymen!

To unite the supremacy of Great Britain and the liberty of America is utterly impossible. So vast a continent, and of such a distance from the seat of empire, will every day grow more unmanageable. The motion of so unwieldy a body cannot be directed with any despatch and uniformity without committing to the Parliament of Great Britain powers inconsistent with our freedom. The authority and force which would be absolutely necessary for the preservation of the peace and good order of this continent would put all our valuable rights within the reach of that nation.

As the administration of government requires firmer and more numerous supports in proportion to its extent, the

burdens imposed on us would be excessive, and we should have the melancholy prospect of their increasing on our posterity. The scale of officers, from the rapacious and needy commissioner to the haughty governor, and from the governor, with his hungry train, to perhaps a licentious and prodigal viceroy, must be upheld by you and your children. The fleets and armies which will be employed to silence your murmurs and complaints must be supported by the fruits of your industry.

And yet with all this enlargement of the expense and powers of government, the administration of it at such a distance, and over so extensive a territory, must necessarily fail in putting the laws into vigorous execution, removing private oppressions, and forming plans for the advancement of agriculture and commerce, and preserving the vast empire in any tolerable peace and security. If our posterity retain any spark of patriotism, they can never tamely submit to such burdens. This country will be made the field of bloody contention till it gain that independence for which nature formed it. It is, therefore, injustice and cruelty to our offspring, and would stamp us with the character of baseness and cowardice, to leave the salvation of this country to be worked out by them with accumulated difficulty and danger.

Prejudice, I confess, may warp our judgments. Let us hear the decision of Englishmen on this subject, who cannot be suspected of partiality. "The Americans," they say, "are but little short of half our number. To this number they have grown from a small body of original settlers by a very rapid increase. The probability is that they will go on to increase, and that in fifty or sixty years they will be double our number, and form a mighty empire, consisting of a variety of states, all equal or superior to ourselves in all the arts and accomplishments which give dignity and happiness to human life. In that period will they be still bound to acknowledge that supremacy over them which we now claim? Can there be any person who will assert this, or whose mind does not revolt at the idea of a vast continent holding all that is valuable to it at the discretion of a handful of people on the other side of the Atlantic? But if at that period this would be unreason-

able, what makes it otherwise now? Draw the line if you can. But there is still a greater difficulty.

"Britain is now, I will suppose, the seat of liberty and virtue, and its legislature consists of a body of able and independent men, who govern with wisdom and justice. The time may come when all will be reversed; when its excellent constitution of government will be subverted; when, pressed by debts and taxes, it will be greedy to draw to itself an increase of revenue from every distant province, in order to ease its own burdens; when the influence of the crown, strengthened by luxury and a universal profligacy of manners, will have tainted every heart, broken down every fence of liberty, and rendered us a nation of tame and contented vassals; when a general election will be nothing but a general auction of boroughs, and when the Parliament, the grand council of the nation, and once the faithful guardian of the state and a terror to evil ministers, will be degenerated into a body of sycophants, dependent and venal, always ready to confirm any measures, and little more than a public court for registering royal edicts. Such, it is possible, may, some time or other, be the state of Great Britain. What will, at that period, be the duty of the colonies? Will they be still bound to unconditional submission? Must they always continue an appendage to our government and follow it implicitly through every change that can happen to it? Wretched condition, indeed, of millions of freemen as good as ourselves! Will you say that we now govern equitably, and that there is no danger of such revolution? Would to God that this were true! But you will not always say the same. Who shall judge whether we govern equitably or not? Can you give the colonies any security that such a period will never come?" No! THE PERIOD, COUNTRYMEN, IS ALREADY COME. The calamities were at our door. The rod of oppression was raised over us. We were roused from our slumbers, and may we never sink into repose until we can convey a clear and undisputed inheritance to our posterity! This day we are called upon to give a glorious example of what the wisest and best of men were rejoiced to view, only in speculation. This day presents the world with the most august spectacle that its annals ever unfolded—millions of free-

men, deliberately and voluntarily forming themselves into a society for their common defense and common happiness. Immortal spirits of Hampden, Locke, and Sidney, will it not add to your benevolent joys to behold your posterity rising to the dignity of men, and evincing to the world the reality and expediency of your systems, and in the actual enjoyment of that equal liberty, which you were happy, when on earth, in delineating and recommending to mankind?

Other nations have received their laws from conquerors; some are indebted for a constitution to the suffering of their ancestors through revolving centuries. The people of this country, alone, have formally and deliberately chosen a government for themselves, and with open and uninfluenced consent bound themselves into a social compact. Here no man proclaims his birth or wealth as a title to honorable distinction, or to sanctify ignorance and vice with the name of hereditary authority. He who has most zeal and ability to promote public felicity, let him be the servant of the public. This is the only line of distinction drawn by nature. Leave the bird of night to the obscurity for which nature intended him, and expect only from the eagle to brush the clouds with his wings and look boldly in the face of the sun.

Some who would persuade us that they have tender feelings for future generations, while they are insensible to the happiness of the present, are perpetually foreboding a train of dissensions under our popular system. Such men's reasoning amounts to this: Give up all that is valuable to Great Britain and then you will have no inducements to quarrel among yourselves; or, Suffer yourselves to be chained down by your enemies, that you may not be able to fight with your friends.

This is an insult on your virtue as well as your common sense. Your unanimity this day and through the course of the war is a decisive refutation of such invidious predictions. Our enemies have already had evidence that our present constitution contains in it the justice and ardor of freedom and the wisdom and vigor of the most absolute system. When the law is the will of the people, it will be uniform and coherent; but fluctuation, contradiction, and inconsistency of councils must be expected under those

governments where every revolution in the ministry of a court produces one in the state—such being the folly and pride of all ministers, that they ever pursue measures directly opposite to those of their predecessors.

We shall neither be exposed to the necessary convulsions of elective monarchies, nor to the want of wisdom, fortitude, and virtue to which hereditary succession is liable. In your hands it will be to perpetuate a prudent, active, and just legislature, which will never expire until you yourselves lose the virtues which give it existence.

And, brethren and fellow countrymen, if it was ever granted to mortals to trace the designs of Providence, and interpret its manifestations in favor of their cause, we may, with humility of soul, cry out, "Not unto us, not unto us, but to thy Name be the praise!" The confusion of the devices among our enemies, and the rage of the elements against them, have done almost as much toward our success as either our councils or our arms.

The time at which this attempt on our liberty was made, when we were ripened into maturity, had acquired a knowledge of war, and were free from the incursions of enemies in this country, the gradual advances of our oppressors enabling us to prepare for our defense; the unusual fertility of our lands and clemency of the seasons; the success which at first attended our feeble arms, producing unanimity among our friends and reducing our internal foes to acquiescence—these are all strong and palpable marks and assurances that Providence is yet gracious unto Zion, that it will turn away the captivity of Jacob.

Our glorious reformers when they broke through the fetters of superstition effected more than could be expected from an age so darkened. But they left much to be done by their posterity. They lopped off, indeed, some of the branches of Popery, but they left the root and stock, when they left us under the domination of human systems and decisions, usurping the infallibility which can be attributed to revelation alone. They dethroned one usurper only to raise up another; they refused allegiance to the pope only to place the civil magistrate in the throne of Christ, vested with authority to enact laws and inflict penalties in His kingdom. And if we now cast our eyes over the nations

of the earth, we shall find that, instead of possessing the pure religion of the Gospel, they may be divided either into infidels, who deny the truth; or politicians, who make religion a stalking horse for their ambition; or professors, who walk in the trammels of orthodoxy, and are more attentive to traditions and ordinances of men than to the oracles of truth.

The civil magistrate has everywhere contaminated religion by making it an engine of policy; and freedom of thought and the right of private judgment in matters of conscience, driven from every other corner of the earth, direct their course to this happy country as their last asylum. Let us cherish the noble guests, and shelter them under the wings of a universal toleration! Be this the seat of unbounded religious freedom. She will bring with her in her train industry, wisdom, and commerce. She thrives most when left to shoot forth in her natural luxuriance, and asks from human policy only not to be checked in her growth by artificial encouragements.

Thus, by the beneficence of Providence, we shall behold our empire arising, founded on justice and the voluntary consent of the people, and giving full scope to the exercise of those faculties and rights which most ennoble our species. Besides the advantages of liberty and the most equal constitution, Heaven has given us a country with every variety of climate and soil, pouring forth in abundance whatever is necessary for the support, comfort, and strength of a nation. Within our own borders we possess all the means of sustenance, defense, and commerce; at the same time, these advantages are so distributed among the different states of this continent, as if nature had in view to proclaim to us: Be united among yourselves, and you will want nothing from the rest of the world.

The more northern states most amply supply us with every necessary, and many of the luxuries of life; with iron, timber, and masts for ships of commerce or of war; with flax for the manufacture of linen, and seed either for oil or exportation.

So abundant are our harvests, that almost every part raises more than double the quantity of grain requisite for the support of the inhabitants. From Georgia and the

Carolinas we have, as well for our own wants as for the purpose of supplying the wants of other powers, indigo, rice, hemp, naval stores, and lumber.

Virginia and Maryland teem with wheat, Indian corn, and tobacco. Every nation whose harvest is precarious, or whose lands yield not those commodities which we cultivate, will gladly exchange their superfluities and manufactures for ours.

We have already received many and large cargoes of clothing, military stores, etc., from our commerce with foreign powers, and, in spite of the efforts of the boasted navy of England, we shall continue to profit by this connection.

The want of our naval stores has already increased the price of these articles to a great height, especially in Britain. Without our lumber it will be impossible for those haughty islanders to convey the products of the West Indies to their own ports; for a while they may with difficulty effect it, but, without our assistance, their resources soon must fail. Indeed, the West India Islands appear as the necessary appendages to this our empire. They must owe their support to it, and ere long, I doubt not, some of them will, from necessity, wish to enjoy the benefit of our protection.

These natural advantages will enable us to remain independent of the world, or make it the interest of European powers to court our alliance, and aid in protecting us against the invasion of others. What argument, therefore, do we want to show the equity of our conduct; or motive of interest to recommend it to our prudence? Nature points out the path, and our enemies have obliged us to pursue it.

If there is any man so base or so weak as to prefer a dependence on Great Britain to the dignity and happiness of living a member of a free and independent nation, let me tell him that necessity now demands what the generous principle of patriotism should have dictated.

We have no other alternative than independence, or the most ignominious and galling servitude. The legions of our enemies thicken on our plains; desolation and death mark their bloody career; whilst the mangled corpses of our countrymen seem to cry out to us as a voice from heaven:—

"Will you permit our posterity to groan under the galling chains of our murderers? Has our blood been expended in vain? Is the only benefit which our constancy till death has obtained for our country, that it should be sunk into a deeper and more ignominious vassalage? Recollect who are the men that demand your submission, to whose decrees you are invited to pay obedience. Men who, unmindful of their relation to you as brethren; of your long implicit submission to their laws; of the sacrifice which you and your forefathers made of your natural advantages for commerce to their avarice; formed a deliberate plan to wrest from you the small pittance of property which they had permitted you to acquire. Remember that the men who wish to rule over you are they who, in pursuit of this plan of despotism, annulled the sacred contracts which they had made with your ancestors; conveyed into your cities a mercenary soldiery to compel you to submission by insult and murder; who called your patience cowardice, your piety hypocrisy."

Countrymen, the men who now invite you to surrender your rights into their hands are the men who have let loose the merciless savages to riot in the blood of their brethren; who have dared to establish Popery triumphant in our land; who have taught treachery to your slaves, and courted them to assassinate your wives and children.

These are the men to whom we are exhorted to sacrifice the blessings which Providence holds out to us: the happiness, the dignity, of uncontrolled freedom and independence.

Let not your generous indignation be directed against any among us who may advise so absurd and maddening a measure. Their number is but few, and daily decreases; and the spirit which can render them patient of slavery will render them contemptible enemies.

Our union is now complete; our constitution composed, established, and approved. You are now the guardians of your own liberties. We may justly address you, as the *decemviri* did the Romans, and say: "Nothing that we propose can pass into a law without your consent. Be yourselves, O Americans, the authors of those laws on which your happiness depends."

You have now in the field armies sufficient to repel the whole force of your enemies and their base and mercenary auxiliaries. The hearts of your soldiers beat high with the spirit of freedom; they are animated with the justice of

their cause, and while they grasp their swords can look up to Heaven for assistance. Your adversaries are composed of wretches who laugh at the rights of humanity, who turn religion into derision, and would, for higher wages, direct their swords against their leaders or their country. Go on, then, in your generous enterprise, with gratitude to Heaven for past success, and confidence of it in the future. For my own part, I ask no greater blessing than to share with you the common danger and common glory. If I have a wish dearer to my soul than that my ashes may be mingled with those of a Warren and a Montgomery, it is that these American States may never cease to be free and independent.

ÆSCHINES

AGAINST CROWNING DEMOSTHENES

[Æschines was born in Athens in 389 B.C., six years before his life-long rival Demosthenes. According to that rival his parents taught a primary school, he assisting them in his youth. Later he was an actor, then became a scribe, in which occupation he gained a knowledge of the governmental system of Greece, which proved a valuable preparation for his chosen profession—public speaking. Æschines served in various Athenian expeditions, and in 347 B.C. went on an unsuccessful envoyship into the Peloponnesus to form a Greek union against Philip of Macedon. He was accused, while acting on an embassy sent to Philip, of traitorous intrigue with the king, which accusation further developments seemed to bear out. When Philip finally conquered Greece, Æschines boasted of his intimacy with him, offering to use his influence to secure leniency for the Greeks. Accusing Ctesiphon of advocating an unconstitutional measure in proposing to give Demosthenes a crown for his patriotic services, Æschines gave notice that he would take action against him. He delayed the action for six years, seizing a moment of patriotic agitation to deliver a harangue against the whole life and policy of his rival. Demosthenes answered with his magnificent "On the Crown," and as the votes of the people did not sustain Æschines, and as he had incurred the penalty attached to making an unfounded accusation, he was compelled to leave Athens. He went to Rhodes, and finally established there a very successful school of rhetoric. He died in 314 B.C.]

OUR days have not fallen on the common chances of mortal life. We have been set to bequeath a story of marvels to posterity. Is not the King of Persia, he who cut through Athos and bridged the Hellespont, he who demands earth and water from the Greeks, he who in his letters presumes to style himself lord of all men from the sunrise to the sunset, is he not struggling at this hour, no longer for authority over others, but for his own life? Do you not see the men who delivered the Delphian tem-

ple invested not only with that glory but with the leadership against Persia? While Thebes—Thebes, our neighbor city—has been in one day swept from the face of Greece; justly it may be in so far as her general policy was erroneous, yet in consequence of a folly which was no accident, but the judgment of Heaven. The unfortunate Lacedæmonians, though they did but touch this affair in its first phase by the occupation of the temple—they who once claimed the leadership of Greece—are now to be sent to Alexander in Asia to give hostages, to parade their disasters, and to hear their own and their country's doom from his lips, when they have been judged by the clemency of the master they provoked. Our city, the common asylum of the Greeks, from which, of old, embassies used to come from all Greece to obtain deliverance for their several cities at our hands, is now battling, no more for the leadership of Greece, but for the ground on which it stands. And these things have befallen us since Demosthenes took the direction of our policy. The poet Hesiod will interpret such a case. There is a passage meant to educate democracies and to counsel cities generally, in which he warns us not to accept dishonest leaders. I will recite the lines myself, the reason, I think, for our learning the maxims of the poets in boyhood being that we may use them as men:—

> "Oft hath the bad man been the city's bane;
> Oft hath his sin brought to the sinless pain;
> Oft hath all-seeing Heaven sore vexed the town
> With dearth and death and brought the people down;
> Cast down their walls and their most valiant slain,
> And on the seas made all their navies vain."

Strip these lines of their poetic garb, look at them closely, and I think you will say these are no mere verses of Hesiod—that they are a prophecy of the administration of Demosthenes, for by the agency of that administration our ships, our armies, our cities have been swept from the earth. . . . "Oh, yes," it will be replied, "but then he is a friend of the constitution." If, indeed, you have a regard only to his delicacy you will be deceived as you were before, but not if you look at his character and at the facts. I will help you to estimate the characteristics which ought

to be found in a friend of the constitution; in a sober-minded citizen. I will oppose to them the character that may be looked for in an unprincipled revolutionist. Then you shall draw your comparison and consider on which part he stands—not in his language, remember, but in his life. Now all, I think, will allow that these attributes should belong to a friend of the constitution: First, that he should be of free descent by both parents, so that the disadvantage of birth may not embitter him against those laws which preserve the democracy. Second, that he should be able to show that some benefit has been done to the people by his ancestors; or, at the worst, that there had been no enmity between them which would prompt him to revenge the misfortunes of his fathers on the state. Third, he should be virtuous and temperate in his private life, so that no profligate expense may lead him into taking bribes to the hurt of the people. Next, he should be sagacious and able to speak—since our ideal is that the best course should be chosen by the intelligence and then commended to his hearers by the trained eloquence of the orator—though, if we cannot have both, sagacity must needs take rank before eloquence. Lastly, he must have a stout heart, or he may play the country false in the crisis of danger or of war. The friend of oligarchy must be the opposite of all this. I need not repeat the points. Now, consider: How does Demosthenes answer to these conditions?

[After accusing Demosthenes of being by parentage half a Scythian, Greek in nothing but language, the orator proceeds]:—

In his private life, what is he? The tetrarch sank to rise a pettifogger, a spendthrift, ruined by his own follies. Then having got a bad name in his trade, too, by showing his speeches to the other side, he bounded on the stage of public life, where his profits out of the city were as enormous as his savings were small. Now, however, the flood of royal gold has floated his extravagance. But not even this will suffice. No wealth could ever hold out long against vice. In a word, he draws his livelihood not from his own resources but from your dangers. What, however, are his qualifications in respect to sagacity and to power of speech? A clever speaker, an evil liver! And what is the

result to Athens? The speeches are fair; the deeds are vile! Then as to courage I have a word to say. If he denied his cowardice or if you were not aware of it, the topic might have called for discussion; but since he himself admits in the assemblies and you know it, it remains only to remind you of the laws on the subject. Solon, our ancient lawgiver, thought the coward should be liable to the same penalties as the man who refuses to serve or who has quitted his post. Cowardice, like other offenses, is indictable.

Some of you will, perhaps, ask in amazement, Is a man to be indicted for his temperament? He is. And why? In order that every one of us, fearing the penalties of the law more than the enemy, may be the better champion of his country. Accordingly, the lawgiver excludes alike the man who declines service, the coward, and the deserter of his post, from the lustral limits in the market-place, and suffers no such person to receive a wreath of honor or to enter places of public worship. But you, Ctesiphon, exhort us to set a crown on the head to which the laws refuse it. You by your private edict call a forbidden guest into the forefront of our solemn festival, and invite into the temple of Dionysios that dastard by whom all temples have been betrayed. . . . Remember then, Athenians, that the city whose fate rests with you is no alien city, but your own. Give the prizes of ambition by merit, not by chance. Reserve your rewards for those whose manhood is truer, whose characters are worthier. Look at each other and judge not only with your ears but with your eyes who of your number are likely to support Demosthenes. His young companions in the chase or the gymnasium? No, by the Olympian Zeus! He has not spent his life in hunting or in any healthful exercise, but in cultivating rhetoric to be used against men of property. Think of his boastfulness when he claims by his embassy to have snatched Byzantium out of the hands of Philip, to have thrown the Acharnians into revolt, to have astonished the Thebans with his harangue! He thinks that you have reached the point of fatuity at which you can be made to believe even this—as if your citizen were the deity of persuasion instead of a pettifogging mortal! And when, at the end of his

speech, he calls as his advocates those who shared his bribes, imagine that you see upon this platform, where I now speak before you, an array drawn up to confront their profligacy—the benefactors of Athens: Solon, who set in order the Democracy by his glorious laws, the philosopher, the good legislator, entreating you with the gravity which so well became him never to set the rhetoric of Demosthenes above your oaths and above the laws; Aristides, who assessed the tribute of the confederacy, and whose daughters after his death were dowered by the state—indignant at the contumely threatened to justice and asking, Are you not ashamed? When Arthmios of Zeleia brought Persian gold to Greece and visited Athens, our fathers well-nigh put him to death, though he was our public guest, and proclaimed him expelled from Athens and from all territory that the Athenians rule; while Demosthenes, who has not brought us Persian gold, but has taken bribes for himself and has kept them to this day, is about to receive a golden wreath from you! And Themistocles, and they who died at Marathon and Platæa, aye, and the very graves of our forefathers—do you not think they will utter a voice of lamentation, if he who covenants with barbarians to work against Greece shall be—crowned!

FISHER AMES

ON THE BRITISH TREATY

[Fisher Ames, an American statesman, was born in Massachusetts in 1758. He completed a course at Harvard and opened a law office in Boston. The National Constitution had just been proposed to the states, and he advocated it in a vivid speech before the convention that finally ratified it on behalf of his commonwealth. He allied himself with the Federalists and was sent by them to Congress, where he stood manfully by the Washington administration and became famous all over the land as a maker of speeches. When Jay's treaty with Great Britain met with universal denunciation, Ames spoke in its favor, the result being to sweep the listening congressmen off their feet. One of them begged that the whole subject be allowed to go over, because Ames' oratory was too eloquent to leave them in a dispassionate frame of mind. The New England orator stayed eight years in Congress, and then retired because his health gave way. When Washington died, the state legislature thought him the only fit man in Massachusetts to deliver his eulogy. Ames was later chosen president of Harvard, but declined the honor. He died in 1808. The speech that follows, on the treaty between the United States and England, was made in the House of Representatives in 1796.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I entertain the hope, perhaps a rash one, that my strength will hold me out to speak a few minutes.

In my judgment, a right decision will depend more on the temper and manner with which we may prevail upon ourselves to contemplate the subject, than upon the development of any profound political principles, or any remarkable skill in the application of them. If we could succeed to neutralize our inclinations, we should find less difficulty than we have to apprehend in surmounting all our objections.

The suggestion a few days ago that the House manifested symptoms of heat and irritation, was made and

retorted as if the charge ought to create surprise, and would convey reproach. Let us be more just to ourselves and to the occasion. Let us not affect to deny the existence and the intrusion of some portion of prejudice and feeling into the debate, when, from the very structure of our nature, we ought to anticipate the circumstance as a probability, and when we are admonished by the evidence of our senses that it is the fact.

How can we make professions for ourselves, and offer exhortations to the House, that no influence should be felt but that of duty, and no guide respected but that of the understanding, while the peal to rally every passion of man is continually ringing in our ears?

Our understandings have been addressed, it is true, and with ability and effect; but, I demand, has any corner of the heart been left unexplored? It has been ransacked to find auxiliary arguments, and, when that attempt failed, to awaken the sensibilities that would require none. Every prejudice and feeling has been summoned to listen to some peculiar style of address; and yet we seem to believe, and to consider a doubt as an affront, that we are strangers to any influence but that of unbiased reason.

It would be strange that a subject which has roused in turn all the passions of the country, should be discussed without the interference of any of our own. We are men, and therefore not exempt from those passions: as citizens and representatives we feel the interests that must excite them. The hazard of great interests cannot fail to agitate strong passions. We are not disinterested; it is impossible we should be dispassionate. The warmth of such feelings may becloud the judgment, and, for a time, pervert the understanding. But the public sensibility, and our own, has sharpened the spirit of inquiry, and given an animation to the debate. The public attention has been quickened to mark the progress of the discussion, and its judgment, often hasty and erroneous on first impressions, has become solid and enlightened at last. Our result will, I hope, on that account, be the safer and more mature, as well as more accordant with that of the nation. The only constant agents in political affairs are the passions of men. Shall we complain of our nature—shall we say that man ought to

have been made otherwise? It is right already, because He, from whom we derive our nature, ordained it so; and because thus made and thus acting, the cause of truth and the public good is the more surely promoted.

But an attempt has been made to produce an influence of a nature more stubborn, and more unfriendly to truth. It is very unfairly pretended that the constitutional right of this House is at stake, and to be asserted and preserved only by a vote in the negative. We hear it said that this is a struggle for liberty, a manly resistance against the design to nullify this assembly, and to make it a cipher in the government: that the President and Senate, the numerous meetings in the cities, and the influence of the general alarm of the country, are the agents and instruments of a scheme of coercion and terror, to force the treaty down our throats, though we loathe it, and in spite of the clearest convictions of duty and conscience.

It is necessary to pause here and inquire whether suggestions of this kind be not unfair in their very texture and fabric, and pernicious in all their influences. They oppose an obstacle in the path of inquiry, not simply discouraging, but absolutely insurmountable. They will not yield to argument; for as they were not reasoned up, they cannot be reasoned down. They are higher than a Chinese wall in truth's way, and built of materials that are indestructible. While this remains, it is vain to argue; it is vain to say to this mountain, Be thou cast into the sea. For, I ask of the men of knowledge of the world, whether they would not hold him for a blockhead that should hope to prevail in an argument whose scope and object is to mortify the self-love of the expected proselyte? I ask further, when such attempts have been made, have they not failed of success? The indignant heart repels a conviction that is believed to debase it.

The self-love of an individual is not warmer in its sense, nor more constant in its action, than what is called in French, *l'esprit de corps*, or the self-love of an assembly; that jealous affection which a body of men is always found to bear toward its own prerogatives and power. I will not condemn this passion. Why should we urge an unmeaning censure, or yield to groundless fears that truth and duty

will be abandoned, because men in a public assembly are still men, and feel that *esprit de corps* which is one of the laws of their nature? Still less should we despond or complain, if we reflect that this very spirit is a guardian instinct, that watches over the life of this assembly. It cherishes the principle of self-preservation, and without its existence, and its existence with all the strength we see it possess, the privileges of the representatives of the people, and mediately the liberties of the people, would not be guarded, as they are, with a vigilance that never sleeps, and an unrelaxing constancy and courage.

If the consequences, most unfairly attributed to the vote in the affirmative, were not chimerical, and worse, for they are deceptive, I should think it a reproach to be found even moderate in my zeal to assert the constitutional powers of this assembly; and whenever they shall be in real danger, the present occasion affords proof that there will be no want of advocates and champions.

Indeed, so prompt are these feelings, and when once roused, so difficult to pacify, that if we could prove the alarm was groundless, the prejudice against the appropriations may remain on the mind, and it may even pass for an act of prudence and duty to negative a measure which was lately believed by ourselves, and may hereafter be misconceived by others, to encroach upon the powers of the House. Principles that bear a remote affinity with usurpation on those powers will be rejected, not merely as errors, but as wrongs. Our sensibilities will shrink from a post, where it is possible they may be wounded, and be inflamed by the slightest suspicion of an assault.

While these prepossessions remain, all argument is useless. It may be heard with the ceremony of attention, and lavish its own resources, and the patience it wearies, to no manner of purpose. The ears may be open, but the mind will remain locked up, and every pass to the understanding guarded.

Unless, therefore, this jealous and repulsive fear for the rights of the House can be allayed, I will not ask a hearing.

I cannot press this topic too far; I cannot address myself with too much emphasis to the magnanimity and candor of those who sit here, to suspect their own feelings,

and, while they do, to examine the grounds of their alarm. I repeat it, we must conquer our persuasion, that this body has an interest in one side of the question more than the other, before we attempt to surmount our objections. On most subjects, and solemn ones too, perhaps in the most solemn of all, we form our creed more from inclination than evidence.

Let me expostulate with gentlemen to admit, if it be only by way of supposition, and for a moment, that it is barely possible they have yielded too suddenly to their alarms for the powers of this House; that the addresses, which have been made with such variety of forms, and with so great dexterity in some of them, to all that is prejudice and passion in the heart, are either the effects or the instruments of artifice and deception, and then let them see the subject once more in its singleness and simplicity.

It will be impossible, on taking a fair review of the subject, to justify the passionate appeals that have been made to us to struggle for our liberties and rights, and the solemn exhortations to reject the proposition, said to be concealed in that on your table, to surrender them forever. In spite of this mock solemnity, I demand, if the House will not concur in the measure to execute the treaty, what other course shall we take? How many ways of proceeding lie open before us?

In the nature of things there are but three: we are either to make the treaty, to observe it, or break it. It would be absurd to say we will do neither. If I may repeat a phrase already so much abused, we are under coercion to do one of them, and we have no power, by the exercise of our discretion, to prevent the consequences of a choice.

By refusing to act, we choose. The treaty will be broken and fall to the ground. Where is the fitness, then, of replying to those who urge upon the House the topics of duty and policy, that they attempt to force the treaty down, and to compel this assembly to renounce its discretion and to degrade itself to the rank of a blind and passive instrument in the hands of the treaty-making power? In case we reject the appropriation, we do not secure any greater liberty of action, we gain no safer shelter than before from the consequences of the decision. In-

deed, they are not to be evaded. It is neither just nor manly to complain that the treaty-making power has produced this coercion to act. It is not the art or the despotism of that power, it is the nature of things that compels. Shall we, dreading to become the blind instruments of power, yield ourselves the blinder dupes of mere sounds of imposture? Yet that word, that empty word, coercion, has given scope to an eloquence, that, one would imagine, could not be tired, and did not choose to be quieted.

Let us examine still more in detail the alternatives that are before us, and we shall scarcely fail to see, in still stronger lights, the futility of our apprehensions for the power and liberty of the House.

If, as some have suggested, the thing called a treaty is incomplete, if it has no binding force or obligation, the first question is, Will this House complete the instrument, and, by concurring, impart to it that force which it wants?

The doctrine has been avowed that the treaty, though formally ratified by the executive power of both nations, though published as a law for our own by the President's proclamation, is still a mere proposition submitted to this assembly, no way distinguishable in point of authority or obligation from a motion for leave to bring in a bill, or any other original act of ordinary legislation. This doctrine, so novel in our country, yet so dear to many, precisely for the reason that in the contention for power, victory is always dear, is obviously repugnant to the very terms as well as the fair interpretation of our own resolutions—[Mr. Blount's]. We declare that the treaty-making power is exclusively vested in the President and Senate, and not in this House. Need I say that we fly in the face of that resolution when we pretend that the acts of that power are not valid until we have concurred in them? It would be nonsense, or worse, to use the language of the most glaring contradiction, and to claim a share in a power which we at the same time disclaim as exclusively vested in other departments.

What can be more strange than to say that the compacts of the President and Senate with foreign nations are treaties, without our agency, and yet those compacts want all power and obligation until they are sanctioned by our

concurrence? It is not my design in this place, if at all, to go into the discussion of this part of the subject. I will, at least for the present, take it for granted that this monstrous opinion stands in little need of remark, and if it does, lies almost out of the reach of refutation.

But, say those who hide the absurdity under the cover of ambiguous phrases, have we no discretion? and if we have, are we not to make use of it in judging of the expediency or inexpediency of the treaty? Our resolution claims that privilege, and we cannot surrender it without equal inconsistency and breach of duty.

If there be any inconsistency in the case, it lies, not in making the appropriations for the treaty, but in the resolution itself—[Mr. Blount's]. Let us examine it more nearly. A treaty is a bargain between nations, binding in good faith; and what makes a bargain? The assent of the contracting parties. We allow that the treaty power is not in this House; this House has no share in contracting, and is not a party: of consequence, the President and Senate alone may make a treaty that is binding in good faith. We claim, however, say the gentlemen, a right to judge of the expediency of treaties; that is the constitutional province of our discretion. Be it so. What follows? Treaties, when adjudged by us to be inexpedient, fall to the ground, and the public faith is not hurt. This, incredible and extravagant as it may seem, is asserted. The amount of it, in plainer language, is this—the President and Senate are to make national bargains, and this House has nothing to do in making them. But bad bargains do not bind this House, and, of inevitable consequence, do not bind the nation. When a national bargain, called a treaty, is made, its binding force does not depend upon the making, but upon our opinion that it is good. As our opinion on the matter can be known and declared only by ourselves, when sitting in our legislative capacity, the treaty, though ratified, and, as we choose to term it, made, is hung up in suspense, till our sense is ascertained. We condemn the bargain, and it falls, though, as we say, our faith does not. We approve a bargain as expedient, and it stands firm, and binds the nation. Yet, even in this latter case, its force is plainly not derived from the ratification by the treaty-making

power, but from our approbation. Who will trace these inferences, and pretend that we have no share, according to the argument, in the treaty-making power? These opinions, nevertheless, have been advocated with infinite zeal and perseverance. Is it possible that any man can be hardy enough to avow them and their ridiculous consequences?

Let me hasten to suppose the treaty is considered as already made, and then the alternative is fairly presented to the mind, whether we will observe the treaty or break it. This, in fact, is the naked question.

If we choose to observe it with good faith, our course is obvious. Whatever is stipulated to be done by the nation must be complied with. Our agency, if it should be requisite, cannot be properly refused. And I do not see why it is not as obligatory a rule of conduct for the legislative as for the courts of law.

I cannot lose this opportunity to remark that the coercion, so much dreaded and declaimed against, appears at length to be no more than the authority of principles, the despotism of duty. Gentlemen complain we are forced to act in this way, we are forced to swallow the treaty. It is very true, unless we claim the liberty of abuse, the right to act as we ought not. There is but one right way open for us, the laws of morality and good faith have fenced up every other. What sort of liberty is that which we presume to exercise against the authority of those laws? It is for tyrants to complain that principles are restraints, and that they have no liberty so long as their despotism has limits. These principles will be unfolded by examining the remaining question, Shall we break the treaty?

The treaty is bad, fatally bad, is the cry. It sacrifices the interest, the honor, the independence of the United States, and the faith of our engagements to France. If we listen to the clamor of party intemperance, the evils are of a number not to be counted, and of a nature not to be borne, even in idea. The language of passion and exaggeration may silence that of sober reason in other places; it has not done it here. The question here is, whether the treaty be really so very fatal as to oblige the nation to break its faith. I admit that such a treaty ought not to be executed. I admit that self-preservation is the first law of society, as

well as of individuals. It would, perhaps, be deemed an abuse of terms to call that a treaty which violates such a principle. I waive also, for the present, any inquiry what departments shall represent the nation, and annul the stipulations of a treaty. I content myself with pursuing the inquiry, whether the nature of this compact be such as to justify our refusal to carry it into effect. A treaty is the promise of a nation. Now, promises do not always bind him that makes them.

But I lay down two rules which ought to guide us in this case. The treaty must appear to be bad, not merely in the petty details, but in its character, principle, and mass. And in the next place, this ought to be ascertained by the decided and general concurrence of the enlightened public. I confess there seems to me something very like ridicule thrown over the debate by the discussion of the articles in detail.

The undecided point is, Shall we break our faith? And while our country and enlightened Europe await the issue with more than curiosity, we are employed to gather piecemeal, and article by article, from the instrument, a justification for the deed by trivial calculations of commercial profit and loss. This is little worthy of the subject, of this body, or of the nation. If the treaty is bad, it will appear to be so in its mass. Evil to a fatal extreme, if that be its tendency, requires no proof; it brings it. Extremes speak for themselves and make their own law. What if the direct voyage of American ships to Jamaica with horses or lumber might net one or two per cent. more than the present trade to Surinam; would the proof of the fact avail anything in so grave a question as the violation of the public engagements?

It is in vain to allege that our faith, plighted to France, is violated by this new treaty. Our prior treaties are expressly saved from the operation of the British treaty. And what do those mean who say that our honor was forfeited by treating at all, and especially by such a treaty? Justice, the laws and practise of nations, a just regard for peace as a duty to mankind, and the known wish of our citizens, as well as that self-respect which required it of the nation to act with dignity and moderation—all these

forbade an appeal to arms before we had tried the effect of negotiation. The honor of the United States was saved, not forfeited, by treating. The treaty itself, by its stipulations for the posts, for indemnity, and for a due observation of our neutral rights, has justly raised the character of the nation. Never did the name of America appear in Europe with more luster than upon the event of ratifying this instrument. The fact is of a nature to overcome all contradiction.

But the independence of the country—we are colonists again. This is the cry of the very men who tell us that France will resent our exercise of the rights of an independent nation to adjust our wrongs with an aggressor, without giving her the opportunity to say, Those wrongs shall subsist and shall not be adjusted. This is an admirable specimen of the spirit of independence. The treaty with Great Britain, it cannot be denied, is unfavorable to this strange sort of independence.

Few men of any reputation for sense, among those who say the treaty is bad, will put that reputation so much at hazard as to pretend that it is so extremely bad as to warrant and require a violation of the public faith. The proper ground of the controversy, therefore, is really unoccupied by the opposers of the treaty; as the very hinge of the debate is on the point, not of its being good or otherwise, but whether it is intolerably and fatally pernicious. If loose and ignorant declaimers have anywhere asserted the latter idea, it is too extravagant, and too solidly refuted, to be repeated here. Instead of any attempt to expose it still further, I will say, and I appeal with confidence to the candor of many opposers of the treaty to acknowledge that if it had been permitted to go into operation silently, like our other treaties, so little alteration of any sort would be made by it in the great mass of our commercial and agricultural concerns, that it would not be generally discovered by its effects to be in force, during the term for which it was contracted. I place considerable reliance on the weight men of candor will give to this remark, because I believe it to be true, and little short of undeniable. When the panic dread of the treaty shall cease, as it certainly must, it will be seen through another medium. Those who shall make

search into the articles for the cause of their alarms, will be so far from finding stipulations that will operate fatally, they will discover few of them that will have any lasting operation at all. Those which relate to the disputes between the two countries will spend their force on the subjects in dispute, and extinguish them. The commercial articles are more of a nature to confirm the existing state of things than to change it. The treaty alarm was purely an address to the imagination and prejudices of the citizens, and not on that account the less formidable. Objections that proceed upon error, in fact or calculation, may be traced and exposed; but such as are drawn from the imagination or addressed to it, elude definition, and return to domineer over the mind, after having been banished from it by truth.

I will not so far abuse the momentary strength that is lent to me by the zeal of the occasion as to enlarge upon the commercial operation of the treaty. I proceed to the second proposition, which I have stated as indispensably requisite to a refusal of the performance of a treaty—will the state of public opinion justify the deed?

No government, not even a despotism, will break its faith without some pretext, and it must be plausible, it must be such as will carry the public opinion along with it. Reasons of policy, if not of morality, dissuade even Turkey and Algiers from breaches of treaty in mere wantonness of perfidy, in open contempt of the reproaches of their subjects. Surely, a popular government will not proceed more arbitrarily, as it is more free; nor with less shame or scruple in proportion as it has better morals. It will not proceed against the faith of treaties at all, unless the strong and decided sense of the nation shall pronounce, not simply that the treaty is not advantageous, but that it ought to be broken and annulled. Such a plain manifestation of the sense of the citizens is indispensably requisite; first, because if the popular apprehensions be not an infallible criterion of the disadvantages of the instrument, their acquiescence in the operation of it is an irrefragable proof that the extreme case does not exist, which alone could justify our setting it aside.

In the next place, this approving opinion of the citizens

is requisite, as the best preventive of the ill consequences of a measure always so delicate, and often so hazardous. Individuals would, in that case at least, attempt to repel the opprobrium that would be thrown upon Congress by those who will charge it with perfidy. They would give weight to the testimony of facts, and the authority of principles, on which the government would rest its vindication. And if war should ensue upon the violation, our citizens would not be divided from their government, nor the ardor of their courage be chilled by the consciousness of injustice, and the sense of humiliation, that sense which makes those despicable who know they are despised.

I add a third reason, and with me it has a force that no words of mine can augment, that a government, wantonly refusing to fulfil its engagements is the corrupter of its citizens. Will the laws continue to prevail in the hearts of the people, when the respect that gives them efficacy is withdrawn from the legislators? How shall we punish vice while we practise it? We have not force, and vain will be our reliance, when we have forfeited the resources of opinion. To weaken government and to corrupt morals are effects of a breach of faith not to be prevented; and from effects they become causes, producing, with augmented activity, more disorder and more corruption; order will be disturbed and the life of the public liberty shortened.

And who, I would inquire, is hardy enough to pretend that the public voice demands the violation of the treaty? The evidence of the sense of the great mass of the nation is often equivocal; but when was it ever manifested with more energy and precision than at the present moment? The voice of the people is raised against the measure of refusing the appropriations. If gentlemen should urge, nevertheless, that all this sound of alarm is a counterfeit expression of the sense of the public, I will proceed to other proofs. If the treaty is ruinous to our commerce, what has blinded the eyes of the merchants and traders? Surely they are not enemies to trade, or ignorant of their own interests. Their sense is not so liable to be mistaken as that of a nation, and they are almost unanimous. The articles stipulating the redress of our injuries by captures on the sea are said to be delusive. By whom is this said?

The very men whose fortunes are staked upon the competency of that redress say no such thing. They wait with anxious fear lest you should annul that compact on which all their hopes are rested.

Thus we offer proof, little short of absolute demonstration, that the voice of our country is raised not to sanction but to deprecate the non-performance of our engagements. It is not the nation, it is one, and but one branch of the government that proposes to reject them. With this aspect of things, to reject is an act of desperation.

I shall be asked why a treaty so good in some articles, and so harmless in others, has met with such unrelenting opposition; and how the clamors against it, from New Hampshire to Georgia, can be accounted for? The apprehensions so extensively diffused, on its first publication, will be vouched as proof that the treaty is bad, and that the people hold it in abhorrence.

I am not embarrassed to find the answer to this insinuation. Certainly a foresight of its pernicious operation could not have created all the fears that were felt or affected. The alarm spread faster than the publication of the treaty. There were more critics than readers. Besides, as the subject was examined, those fears have subsided.

The movements of passion are quicker than those of the understanding. We are to search for the causes of first impressions, not in the articles of this obnoxious and misrepresented instrument, but in the state of the public feeling.

The fervor of the Revolutionary War had not entirely cooled, nor its controversies ceased, before the sensibilities of our citizens were quickened with a tenfold vivacity, by a new and extraordinary subject of irritation. One of the two great nations of Europe underwent a change which has attracted all our wonder, and interested all our sympathies. Whatever they did, the zeal of many went with them, and often went to excess. These impressions met with much to inflame and nothing to restrain them. In our newspapers, in our feasts, and some of our elections, enthusiasm was admitted a merit, a test of patriotism, and that made it contagious. In the opinion of party, we could not love or hate enough. I dare say, in spite of all the obloquy it may provoke, we were extravagant in both. It is my right to

avow that passions so impetuous, enthusiasm so wild, could not subsist without disturbing the sober exercise of reason, without putting at risk the peace and precious interests of our country. They were hazarded. I will not exhaust the little breath I have left, to say how much, nor by whom, or by what means they were rescued from the sacrifice. Shall I be called upon to offer my proofs? They are here, they are everywhere. No one has forgotten the proceedings of 1794. No one has forgotten the captures of our vessels, and the imminent danger of war. The nation thirsted not merely for reparation, but vengeance. Suffering such wrongs, and agitated by such resentments, was it in the power of any words of compact, or could any parchment with its seals prevail at once to tranquilize the people? It was impossible. Treaties in England are seldom popular, and least of all when the stipulations of amity succeed to the bitterness of hatred. Even the best treaty, though nothing be refused, will choke resentment, but not satisfy it. Every treaty is as sure to disappoint extravagant expectations as to disarm extravagant passions. Of the latter, hatred is one that takes no bribes. They who are animated by the spirit of revenge will not be quieted by the possibility of profit.

Why do they complain that the West Indies are not laid open? Why do they lament that any restriction is stipulated on the commerce of the East Indies? Why do they pretend that if they reject this, and insist upon more, more will be accomplished? Let us be explicit—more would not satisfy. If all was granted, would not a treaty of amity with Great Britain still be obnoxious? Have we not this instant heard it urged against our envoy that he was not ardent enough in his hatred of Great Britain? A treaty of amity is condemned because it was not made by a foe, and in the spirit of one. The same gentleman, at the same instant, repeats a very prevailing objection, that no treaty should be made with the enemy of France. No treaty, exclaim others, should be made with a monarch or a despot: there will be no naval security while those sea-robbers domineer on the ocean: their den must be destroyed: that nation must be extirpated.

I like this, sir, because it is sincerity. With feelings

such as these, we do not pant for treaties. Such passions seek nothing and will be content with nothing but the destruction of their object. If a treaty left King George his island, it would not answer; not if he stipulated to pay rent for it. It has been said the world ought to rejoice if Britain was sunk in the sea; if where there are now men and wealth and laws and liberty, there was no more than a sand bank for the sea monsters to fatten on, a space for the storms of the ocean to mingle in conflict.

I object nothing to the good sense or humanity of all this. I yield the point that this is a proof that the age of reason is in progress. Let it be philanthropy, let it be patriotism, if you will, but it is no indication that any treaty would be approved. The difficulty is not to overcome the objections to the terms; it is to restrain the repugnance to any stipulations of amity with the party.

Having alluded to the rival of Great Britain, I am not unwilling to explain myself; I affect no concealment, and I have practised none. While those two great nations agitate all Europe with their quarrels, they will both equally desire, and, with any chance of success, equally endeavor to create an influence in America. Each will exert all its arts to range our strength on its own side. How is this to be effected? Our government is a democratical republic. It will not be disposed to pursue a system of politics in subservience to either France or England, in opposition to the general wishes of the citizens; and, if Congress should adopt such measures, they would not be pursued long, nor with much success. From the nature of our government, popularity is the instrument of foreign influence. Without it, all is labor and disappointment. With that mighty auxiliary, foreign intrigue finds agents, not only volunteers, but competitors for employment, and anything like reluctance is understood to be a crime. Has Britain this means of influence? Certainly not. If her gold could buy adherents, their becoming such would deprive them of all political power and importance. They would not wield popularity as a weapon, but would fall under it. Britain has no influence, and for the reasons just given can have none. She has enough; and God forbid she ever should have more. France, possessed of popular enthusiasm, of party

attachments, has had and still has too much influence on our politics—any foreign influence is too much, and ought to be destroyed. I detest the man and disdain the spirit that can bend to a mean subserviency to the views of any nation. It is enough to be Americans. That character comprehends our duties, and ought to engross our attachments.

But I would not be misunderstood. I would not break the alliance with France; I would not have the connection between the two countries even a cold one. It should be cordial and sincere; but I would banish that influence which, by acting on the passions of the citizens, may acquire a power over the government.

It is no bad proof of the merit of the treaty that, under all these unfavorable circumstances, it should be so well approved. In spite of first impressions, in spite of misrepresentation and party clamor, inquiry has multiplied its advocates; and at last the public sentiment appears to me clearly preponderating to its side.

On the most careful review of the several branches of the treaty, those which respect political arrangements, the spoliations on our trade, and the regulation of commerce, there is little to be apprehended. The evil, aggravated as it is by party, is little in degree and short in duration two years from the end of the European war. I ask, and I would ask the question significantly, what are the inducements to reject the treaty? What great object is to be gained, and fairly gained by it? If, however, as to the merits of the treaty, candor should suspend its approbation, what is there to hold patriotism a moment in balance, as to the violation of it? Nothing; I repeat confidently, nothing. There is nothing before us in that event but confusion and dishonor.

But before I attempt to develop those consequences, I must put myself at ease by some explanation.

Nothing is worse received among men than the confutation of their opinions; and, of these, none are more dear or more vulnerable than their political opinions. To say that a proposition leads to shame and ruin, is almost equivalent to a charge that the supporters of it intend to produce them. I throw myself upon the magnanimity and candor of those who hear me. I cannot do justice to my subject

without exposing, as forcibly as I can, all the evils in prospect. I readily admit that in every science, and most of all in politics, error springs from other sources than the want of sense or integrity. I despise indiscriminate professions of candor and respect. There are individuals opposed to me of whom I am not bound to say anything. But of many, perhaps of a majority of the opposers of the appropriations, it gives me pleasure to declare, they possess my confidence and regard. There are among them individuals for whom I entertain a cordial affection.

The consequences of refusing to make provision for the treaty are not all to be foreseen. By rejecting, vast interests are committed to the sport of the winds. Chance becomes the arbiter of events, and it is forbidden to human foresight to count their number, or measure their extent. Before we resolve to leap into this abyss, so dark and so profound, it becomes us to pause and reflect upon such of the dangers as are obvious and inevitable. If this assembly should be wrought into a temper to defy these consequences, it is vain, it is deceptive, to pretend that we can escape them. It is worse than weakness to say that as to public faith our vote has already settled the question. Another tribunal than our own is already erected. The public opinion, not merely of our own country, but of the enlightened world, will pronounce a judgment that we cannot resist, that we dare not even affect to despise.

Well may I urge it to men who know the worth of character, that it is no trivial calamity to have it contested. Refusing to do what the treaty stipulates shall be done, opens the controversy. Even if we should stand justified at last, a character that is vindicated is something worse than it stood before, unquestioned and unquestionable. Like the plaintiff in an action of slander, we recover a reputation disfigured by invective, and even tarnished by too much handling. In the combat for the honor of the nation it may receive some wounds, which, though they should heal, will leave scars. I need not say, for surely the feelings of every bosom have anticipated, that we cannot guard this sense of national honor, this everlasting fire which alone keeps patriotism warm in the heart, with a sensibility too vigilant and jealous.

If, by executing the treaty, there is no possibility of dishonor, and if, by rejecting, there is some foundation for doubt and for reproach, it is not for me to measure, it is for your own feelings to estimate the vast distance that divides the one side of the alternative from the other.

If, therefore, we should enter on the examination of the question of duty and obligation with some feelings of prepossession, I do not hesitate to say, they are such as we ought to have: it is an after inquiry to determine whether they are such as ought finally to be resisted.

The resolution [Mr. Blount's] is less explicit than the Constitution. Its patrons should have made it more so, if possible, if they had any doubts, or meant the public should entertain none. Is it the sense of that vote, as some have insinuated, that we claim a right, for any cause or no cause at all but our own sovereign will and pleasure, to refuse to execute, and thereby to annul, the stipulations of a treaty—that we have nothing to regard but the expediency or inexpediency of the measure, being absolutely free from all obligation by compact to give it our sanction? A doctrine so monstrous, so shameless, is refuted by being avowed. There are no words you could express it in that would not convey both confutation and reproach. It would outrage the ignorance of the tenth century to believe, it would baffle the casuistry of a papal council to vindicate. I venture to say it is impossible: no less impossible than that we should desire to assert the scandalous privilege of being free after we have pledged our honor.

It is doing injustice to the resolution of the House (which I dislike on many accounts) to strain the interpretation of it to this extravagance. The treaty-making power is declared by it to be vested exclusively in the President and Senate. Will any man in his senses affirm that it can be a treaty before it has any binding force or obligation? If it has no binding force upon us, it has none upon Great Britain. Let candor answer: is Great Britain free from any obligation to deliver the posts in June, and are we willing to signify to her that we think so? Is it with that nation a question of mere expediency or inexpediency to do it, and that, too, even after we have done all that depends upon us to give the treaty effect? No sober man believes this. No

one, who would not join in condemning the faithless proceedings of that nation, if such a doctrine should be avowed and carried into practise—and why complain, if Great Britain is not bound? There can be no breach of faith where none is plighted. I shall be told that she is bound. Surely it follows that if she is bound to performance, our nation is under a similar obligation; if both parties be not obliged, neither is obliged: it is no compact, no treaty. This is a dictate of law and common sense, and every jury in the country has sanctioned it on oath.

It cannot be a treaty and yet no treaty, a bargain, yet no promise; if it is a promise, I am not to read a lecture to show why an honest man will keep his promise.

The reason of the thing, and the words of the resolution of the House, imply that the United States engage their good faith in a treaty. We disclaim, say the majority, the treaty-making power; we of course disclaim (they ought to say) every doctrine that would put a negative upon the doings of that power. It is the prerogative of folly alone to maintain both sides of a proposition.

Will any man affirm the American nation is engaged by good faith to the British nation, but that engagement is nothing to this House? Such a man is not to be reasoned with. Such a doctrine is a coat of mail, that would turn the edge of all the weapons of argument, if they were sharper than a sword. Will it be imagined the King of Great Britain and the President are mutually bound by the treaty, but the two nations are free?

It is one thing for this House to stand in a position that presents an opportunity to break the faith of America, and another to establish a principle that will justify the deed.

We feel less repugnance to believe that any other body is bound by obligation than our own. There is not a man here who does not say that Great Britain is bound by treaty. Bring it nearer home. Is the Senate bound? Just as much as the House, and no more. Suppose the Senate, as part of the treaty power, by ratifying a treaty on Monday, pledges the public faith to do a certain act. Then, in its ordinary capacity as a branch of the legislature, the Senate is called upon on Tuesday to perform that act, for example, an appropriation of money—is the Senate (so

lately under obligation) now free to agree or disagree to the act? If the twenty ratifying senators should rise up and avow these principles, saying, We struggle for liberty, we will not be ciphers, mere puppets, and give their votes accordingly, would not shame blister their tongues, would not infamy tingle in their ears, would not their country, which they had insulted and dishonored, though it should be silent and forgiving, be a revolutionary tribunal, a rack on which their own reflections would stretch them?

This, sir, is a cause that would be dishonored and betrayed if I contented myself with appealing only to the understanding. It is too cold, and its processes are too slow for the occasion. I desire to thank God that, since He has given me an intellect so fallible, He has impressed upon me an instinct that is sure. On a question of shame and honor, reasoning is sometimes useless, and worse. I feel the decision in my pulse—if it throws no light upon the brain, it kindles a fire at the heart.

It is not easy to deny, it is impossible to doubt, that a treaty imposes an obligation on the American nation. It would be childish to consider the President and Senate obliged, and the nation and the House free. What is the obligation—perfect or imperfect? If perfect, the debate is brought to a conclusion. If imperfect, how large a part of our faith is pawned? Is half our honor put at risk, and is that half too cheap to be redeemed? How long has this hair-splitting subdivision of good faith been discovered, and why has it escaped the researches of the writers on the law of nations? Shall we add a new chapter to that law, or insert this doctrine as a supplement to, or more properly a repeal of, the Ten Commandments?

The principles and the example of the British Parliament have been alleged to coincide with the doctrine of those who deny the obligation of the treaty. I have not had the health to make very laborious researches into this subject. I will, however, sketch my view of it. Several instances have been noticed, but the treaty of Utrecht is the only one that seems to be at all applicable. It has been answered, that the conduct of Parliament in that celebrated example affords no sanction to our refusal to carry the treaty into effect. The obligation of the treaty of Utrecht

has been understood to depend on the concurrence of Parliament as a condition to its becoming of force. If that opinion should, however, appear incorrect, still the precedent proves, not that the treaty of Utrecht wanted obligation, but that Parliament disregarded it; a proof, not of the construction of the treaty-making power, but of the violation of a national engagement. Admitting still further, that the Parliament claimed and exercised its power, not as a breach of faith, but as a matter of constitutional right, I reply, that the analogy between Parliament and Congress totally fails. The nature of the British government may require and justify a course of proceeding in respect to treaties that is unwarrantable here.

The British government is a mixed one. The king, at the head of the army, of the hierarchy, with an ample civil list, hereditary, irresponsible, and possessing the prerogative of peace and war, may be properly observed with some jealousy in respect to the exercise of the treaty-making power. It seems, and perhaps from a spirit of caution on this account, to be their doctrine that treaties bind the nation, but are not to be regarded by the courts of law, until laws have been passed conformably to them. Our concurrence has expressly regulated the matter differently. The concurrence of Parliament is necessary to treaties becoming laws in England, gentlemen say; and here the Senate, representing the states, must concur in treaties. The Constitution and the reason of the case make the concurrence of the Senate as effectual as the sanction of Parliament, and why not? The Senate is an elective body, and the approbation of a majority of the states affords the nation as ample security against the abuse of the treaty-making power, as the British nation can enjoy in the control of Parliament.

Whatever doubt there may be as to the parliamentary doctrine of the obligation of treaties in Great Britain (and perhaps there is some), there is none in their books, or their modern practise. Blackstone represents treaties as of the highest obligation, when ratified by the king; and for almost a century there has been no instance of opposition by Parliament to this doctrine. Their treaties have been uniformly carried into effect, although many have been rati

fied of a nature most obnoxious to party, and have produced louder clamor than we have lately witnessed. The example of England, therefore, fairly examined, does not warrant, it dissuades us from a negative vote.

Gentlemen have said, with spirit, Whatever the true doctrine of our Constitution may be, Great Britain has no right to complain or to dictate an interpretation. The sense of the American nation as to the treaty power is to be received by all foreign nations. This is very true as a maxim; but the fact is against those who vouch it. The sense of the American nation is not as the vote of the House has declared it. Our claim to some agency in giving force and obligation to treaties is beyond all kind of controversy novel. The sense of the nation is probably against it. The sense of the government certainly is. The President denies it on constitutional grounds, and therefore cannot ever accede to our interpretation. The Senate ratified the treaty, and cannot without dishonor adopt it, as I have attempted to show. Where then do they find the proof that this is the American sense of the treaty-making power, which is to silence the murmurs of Great Britain? Is it because a majority of two or three, or, at most, of four or five of this House, will reject the treaty? Is it thus the sense of our nation is to be recognized? Our government may thus be stopped in its movements, a struggle for power may thus commence, and the event of the conflict may decide who is the victor, and the quiet possessor of the treaty power. But at present it is beyond all credibility that our vote, by a bare majority, should be believed to do anything better than to embitter our divisions, and to tear up the settled foundations of our departments.

If the obligation of a treaty be complete, I am aware that cases sometimes exist which will justify a nation in refusing a compliance. Are our liberties, gentlemen demand, to be bartered away by a treaty—and is there no remedy? There is. Extremes are not to be supposed, but when they happen, they make the law for themselves. No such extreme can be pretended in this instance, and if it existed, the authority it would confer to throw off the obligation would rest where the obligation itself resides—in the nation. This House is not the nation—it is not the

whole delegated authority of the nation. Being only a part of that authority, its right to act for the whole society obviously depends on the concurrence of the other two branches. If they refuse to concur, a treaty, once made, remains in full force, although a breach on the part of a foreign nation would confer upon our own a right to forbear the execution. I repeat it, even in that case the act of this House cannot be admitted as the act of the nation, and if the President and Senate should not concur, the treaty would be obligatory.

I put a case that will not fail to produce conviction. Our treaty with France engages that free bottoms shall make free goods, and how has it been kept? As such engagements will ever be in time of war. France has set it aside, and pleads imperious necessity. We have no navy to enforce the observance of such articles, and paper barriers are weak against the violence of those who are on the scramble for enemies' goods on the high seas. The breach of any article of a treaty by one nation gives an undoubted right to the other to renounce the whole treaty. But has one branch of the government that right, or must it reside with the whole authority of the nation? What if the Senate should resolve that the French treaty is broken, and therefore null and of no effect? The answer is obvious: you would deny their sole authority. That branch of the legislature has equal power in this regard with the House of Representatives. One branch alone cannot express the will of the nation.

A right to annul a treaty because a foreign nation has broken its articles is only like the case of a sufficient cause to repeal a law. In both cases the branches of our government must concur in the orderly way, or the law and the treaty will remain.

The very cases supposed by my adversaries in this argument conclude against themselves. They will persist in confounding ideas that should be kept distinct, they will suppose that the House of Representatives has no power unless it has all power. The House is nothing if it be not the whole government—the nation.

On every hypothesis, therefore, the conclusion is not to be resisted: we are either to execute this treaty or break our faith.

To expatiate on the value of public faith may pass with some men for declamation—to such men I have nothing to say. To others I will urge—can any circumstance mark upon a people more turpitude and debasement? Can anything tend more to make men think themselves mean, or degrade to a lower point their estimation of virtue and their standard of action?

It would not merely demoralize mankind: it tends to break all the ligaments of society, to dissolve that mysterious charm which attracts individuals to the nation, and to inspire in its stead a repulsive sense of shame and disgust.

What is patriotism? Is it a narrow affection for the spot where a man was born? Are the very clods where we tread entitled to this ardent preference because they are greener? No, sir, this is not the character of the virtue, and it soars higher for its object. It is an extended self-love, mingling with all the enjoyments of life, and twisting itself with the minutest filaments of the heart. It is thus we obey the laws of society, because they are the laws of virtue. In their authority we see, not the array of force and terror, but the venerable image of our country's honor. Every good citizen makes that honor his own, and cherishes it not only as precious, but as sacred. He is willing to risk his life in its defense, and is conscious that he gains protection while he gives it. For what rights of a citizen will be deemed inviolable when a state renounces the principles that constitute their security? Or if his life should not be invaded, what would its enjoyments be in a country odious in the eyes of strangers and dishonored in his own? Could he look with affection and veneration to such a country as his parent? The sense of having one would die within him; he would blush for his patriotism, if he retained any, and justly, for it would be a vice. He would be a banished man in his native land.

I see no exception to the respect that is paid among nations to the law of good faith. If there are cases in this enlightened period when it is violated, there are none when it is decried. It is the philosophy of politics, the religion of governments. It is observed by barbarians—a whiff of tobacco smoke, or a string of beads, gives not merely binding force, but sanctity to treaties. Even in Algiers a truce

may be bought for money; but when ratified, even Algiers is too wise, or too just, to disown and annul its obligations. Thus we see neither the ignorance of savages nor the principles of an association for piracy and rapine, permit a nation to despise its engagements. If, sir, there could be a resurrection from the foot of the gallows, if the victims of justice could live again, collect together and form a society, they would, however loath, soon find themselves obliged to make justice, that justice under which they fell, the fundamental law of their state. They would perceive it was their interest to make others respect, and they would therefore soon pay some respect themselves to the obligations of good faith.

It is painful, I hope it is superfluous, to make even the supposition that America should furnish the occasion of this opprobrium. No, let me not even imagine that a republican government, sprung, as our own is, from a people enlightened and uncorrupted, a government whose origin is right, and whose daily discipline is duty, can, upon solemn debate, make its option to be faithless—can dare to act what despots dare not avow: what our own example evinces, the states of Barbary are unsuspected of. No, let me rather make the supposition that Great Britain refuses to execute the treaty, after we have done everything to carry it into effect. Is there any language of reproach pungent enough to express your commentary on the fact? What would you say, or, rather, what would you not say? Would you not tell them, wherever an Englishman might travel shame would stick to him—he would disown his country? You would exclaim: England, proud of your wealth, and arrogant in the possession of power, blush for these distinctions, which become the vehicles of your dishonor. Such a nation might truly say to corruption, Thou art my father, and to the worm, Thou art my mother and my sister. We should say of such a race of men, their name is a heavier burden than their debt.

I can scarcely persuade myself to believe that the consideration I have suggested requires the aid of any auxiliary. But, unfortunately, auxiliary arguments are at hand. Five millions of dollars, and probably more, on the score of spoliations committed on our commerce, depend

upon the treaty. The treaty offers the only prospect of indemnity. Such redress is promised as the merchants place some confidence in. Will you interpose and frustrate that hope, leaving to many families nothing but beggary and despair? It is a smooth proceeding to take a vote in this body: it takes less than half an hour to call the yeas and nays and reject the treaty. But what is the effect of it? What, but this: the very men, formerly so loud for redress; such fierce champions that even to ask for justice was too mean and too slow, now turn their capricious fury upon the sufferers, and say, by their vote, to them and their families, No longer eat bread; petitioners, go home and starve, we cannot satisfy your wrongs and our resentments.

Will you pay the sufferers out of the treasury? No. The answer was given two years ago, and appears on our journals. Will you give them letters of marque and reprisal to pay themselves by force? No, that is war. Besides, it would be an opportunity for those who have already lost much to lose more. Will you go to war to avenge their injury? If you do, the war will leave you no money to indemnify them. If it should be unsuccessful, you will aggravate existing evils; if successful, your enemy will have no treasure left to give our merchants: the first losses will be confounded with much greater and be forgotten. At the end of a war there must be a negotiation, which is the very point we have already gained; and why relinquish it? And who will be confident that the terms of the negotiation, after a desolating war, would be more acceptable to another House of Representatives than the treaty before us? Members and opinions may be so changed that the treaty would then be rejected for being what the present majority say it should be. Whether we shall go on making treaties and refusing to execute them, I know not. Of this I am certain, it will be very difficult to exercise the treaty-making power on the new principles with much reputation or advantage to the country.

The refusal of the posts (inevitable if we reject the treaty) is a measure too decisive in its nature to be neutral in its consequences. From great causes we are to look for great effects. A plain and obvious one will be, the price of

the western lands will fall. Settlers will not choose to fix their habitation on a field of battle. Those who talk so much of the interest of the United States should calculate how deeply it would be affected by rejecting the treaty; how vast a tract of wild land will almost cease to be property. This loss, let it be observed, will fall upon a fund expressly devoted to sink the national debt. What, then, are we called upon to do? However the form of the vote and the protestations of many may disguise the proceeding, our resolution is in substance, and it deserves to wear the title of, a resolution to prevent the sale of the western lands and the discharge of the public debt.

Will the tendency to Indian hostilities be contested by any one? Experience gives the answer. The frontiers were scourged with war till the negotiation with Great Britain was far advanced, and then the state of hostility ceased. Perhaps the public agents of both nations are innocent of fomenting the Indian War, and perhaps they are not. We ought not, however, to expect that neighboring nations, highly irritated against each other, will neglect the friendship of the savages; the traders will gain an influence and will abuse it; and who is ignorant that their passions are easily raised, and hardly restrained from violence? Their situation will oblige them to choose between this country and Great Britain in case the treaty should be rejected. They will not be our friends and at the same time the friends of our enemies.

But am I reduced to the necessity of proving this point? Certainly the very men who charged the Indian War on the detention of the posts will call for no other proof than the recital of their own speeches. It is remembered with what emphasis, with what acrimony, they expatiated on the burden of taxes, and the drain of blood and treasure into the western country, in consequence of Britain's holding the posts. Until the posts are restored, they exclaimed, the treasury and the frontiers must bleed.

If any, against all these proofs, should maintain that the peace with the Indians will be stable without the posts, to them I will urge another reply. From arguments calculated to produce conviction I will appeal directly to the hearts of those who hear me, and ask whether it is not

already planted there? I resort especially to the convictions of the western gentlemen, whether, supposing no posts and no treaty, the settlers will remain in security? Can they take it upon them to say that an Indian peace, under these circumstances, will prove firm? No, sir, it will not be peace, but a sword: it will be no better than a lure to draw victims within the reach of the tomahawk.

On this theme my emotions are unutterable. If I could find words for them, if my powers bore any proportion to my zeal, I would swell my voice to such a note of remonstrance, it should reach every log house beyond the mountains. I would say to the inhabitants, Wake from your false security; your cruel dangers, your more cruel apprehensions are soon to be renewed; the wounds, yet unhealed, are to be torn open again; in the daytime your path through the woods will be ambushed; the darkness of midnight will glitter with the blaze of your dwellings. You are a father —the blood of your sons shall fatten your corn-fields: you are a mother—the war-whoop shall wake the sleep of the cradle.

On this subject you need not suspect any deception on your feelings. It is a spectacle of horror which cannot be overdrawn. If you have nature in your hearts, it will speak a language, compared with which all I have said or can say will be poor and frigid.

Will it be whispered that the treaty has made me a new champion for the protection of the frontiers? It is known that my voice as well as vote have been uniformly given in conformity with the ideas I have expressed. Protection is the right of the frontiers; it is our duty to give it.

Who will accuse me of wandering out of the subject? Who will say that I exaggerate the tendencies of our measures? Will any one answer by a sneer, that all this is idle preaching? Will any one deny that we are bound, and I would hope to good purpose, by the most solemn sanctions of duty for the vote we give? Are despots alone to be reproached for unfeeling indifference to the tears and blood of their subjects? Are republicans irresponsible? Have the principles on which you ground the reproach upon cabinets and kings no practical influence, no binding force? Are they merely themes of idle declamation, intro-

duced to decorate the morality of a newspaper essay, or to furnish pretty topics of harangue from the windows of that state-house? I trust it is neither too presumptuous nor too late to ask, Can you put the dearest interests of society at risk without guilt and without remorse?

It is vain to offer as an excuse that public men are not to be reproached for the evils that may happen to ensue from their measures. This is very true, where they are unforeseen or inevitable. Those I have depicted are not unforeseen; they are so far from inevitable, we are going to bring them into being by our vote. We choose the consequences, and become as justly answerable for them as for the measure that we know will produce them.

By rejecting the posts, we light the savage fires, we bind the victims. This day we undertake to render account to the widows and orphans whom our decision will make, to the wretches that will be roasted at the stake, to our country, and I do not deem it too serious to say, to conscience and to God. We are answerable, and if duty be anything more than a word of imposture, if conscience be not a bugbear, we are preparing to make ourselves as wretched as our country.

There is no mistake in this case, there can be none. Experience has already been the prophet of events, and the cries of our future victims have already reached us. The western inhabitants are not a silent and uncomplaining sacrifice. The voice of humanity issues from the shade of their wilderness. It exclaims that while one hand is held up to reject this treaty the other grasps a tomahawk. It summons our imagination to the scenes that will open. It is no great effort of the imagination to conceive that events so near are already begun. I can fancy that I listen to the yells of savage vengeance, and the shrieks of torture. Already they seem to sigh in the west wind—already they mingle with every echo from the mountains.

It is not the part of prudence to be inattentive to the tendencies of measures. Where there is any ground to fear that these will be pernicious, wisdom and duty forbid that we should underrate them. If we reject the treaty, will our peace be as safe as if we executed it with good faith? I do honor to the intrepid spirit of those who say it will.

It was formerly understood to constitute the excellence of a man's faith to believe without evidence and against it.

But as opinions on this article are changed, and we are called to act for our country, it becomes us to explore the dangers that will attend its peace, and to avoid them if we can.

Few of us here, and fewer still in proportion of our constituents, will doubt that by rejecting, all those dangers will be aggravated.

The idea of war is treated as a bugbear. This levity is at least unseasonable, and most of all unbecoming some who resort to it.

Who has forgotten the philippics of 1794? The cry then was reparation—no envoy—no treaty—no tedious delays. Now, it seems, the passion subsides, or at least the hurry to satisfy it. Great Britain, say they, will not wage war upon us.

In 1794 it was urged by those who now say no war, that if we built frigates, or resisted the piracies of Algiers, we could not expect peace. Now they give excellent comfort truly. Great Britain has seized our vessels and cargoes to the amount of millions; she holds the posts; she interrupts our trade, say they, as a neutral nation; and these gentlemen, formerly so fierce for redress, assure us, in terms of the sweetest consolation, Great Britain will bear all this patiently. But let me ask the late champions of our rights, will our nation bear it? Let others exult because the aggressor will let our wrongs sleep forever. Will it add, it is my duty to ask, to the patience and quiet of our citizens to see their rights abandoned? Will not the disappointment of their hopes, so long patronized by the government, now in the crisis of their being realized, convert all their passions into fury and despair?

Are the posts to remain forever in the possession of Great Britain? Let those who reject them, when the treaty offers them to our hands, say, if they choose, they are of no importance. If they are, will they take them by force? The argument I am urging would then come to a point. To use force is war. To talk of treaty again is too absurd. Posts and redress must come from voluntary good-will, treaty, or war.

The conclusion is plain: if the state of peace shall continue, so will the British possession of the posts.

Look again at this state of things. On the seacoast, vast losses uncompensated; on the frontier, Indian war, actual encroachment on our territory; everywhere discontent—resentments tenfold more fierce because they will be impotent and humbled; national scorn and abasement.

The disputes of the old treaty of 1783, being left to rankle, will revive the almost extinguished animosities of that period. Wars, in all countries, and most of all in such as are free, arise from the impetuosity of the public feelings. The despotism of Turkey is often obliged by clamor to unsheathe the sword. War might perhaps be delayed, but could not be prevented. The causes of it would remain, would be aggravated, would be multiplied, and soon become intolerable. More captures, more impressments would swell the list of our wrongs and the current of our rage. I make no calculation of the arts of those whose employment it has been, on former occasions, to fan the fire. I say nothing of the foreign money and emissaries that might foment the spirit of hostility, because the state of things will naturally run to violence. With less than their former exertion they would be successful.

Will our government be able to temper and restrain the turbulence of such a crisis? The government, alas, will be in no capacity to govern. A divided people—and divided councils! Shall we cherish the spirit of peace, or show the energies of war? Shall we make our adversary afraid of our strength, or dispose him, by the measures of resentment and broken faith, to respect our rights? Do gentlemen rely on the state of peace because both nations will be worse disposed to keep it; because injuries, and insults still harder to endure, will be mutually offered?

Such a state of things will exist, if we should long avoid war, as will be worse than war. Peace without security, accumulation of injury without redress or the hope of it, resentment against the aggressor, contempt for ourselves, intestine discord and anarchy. Worse than this need not be apprehended, for if worse could happen, anarchy would bring it. Is this the peace gentlemen undertake with such fearless confidence to maintain? Is this the station of

American dignity which the high-spirited champions of our national independence and honor could endure—nay, which they are anxious and almost violent to seize for the country? What is there in the treaty that could humble us so low? Are they the men to swallow their resentments, who so lately were choking with them? If in the case contemplated by them it should be peace, I do not hesitate to declare it ought not to be peace.

Is there anything in the prospect of the interior state of the country to encourage us to aggravate the dangers of a war? Would not the shock of that evil produce another, and shake down the feeble and then unbraced structure of our government? Is this a chimera? Is it going off the ground of matter of fact to say the rejection of the appropriation proceeds upon the doctrine of a civil war of the departments? Two branches have ratified a treaty, and we are going to set it aside. How is this disorder in the machine to be rectified? While it exists, its movements must stop, and when we talk of a remedy, is that any other than the formidable one of a revolutionary interposition of the people? And is this, in the judgment even of my opposers, to execute, to preserve the constitution and the public order? Is this the state of hazard, if not of convulsion, which they can have the courage to contemplate and to brave, or beyond which their penetration can reach and see the issue? They seem to believe, and they act as if they believed, that our union, our peace, our liberty are invulnerable and immortal—as if our happy state was not to be disturbed by our dissensions, and that we are not capable of falling from it by our unworthiness. Some of them have, no doubt, better nerves and better discernment than mine. They can see the bright aspects and happy consequences of all this array of horrors. They can see intestine discords, our government disorganized, our wrongs aggravated, multiplied, and unredressed, peace with dishonor, or war without justice, union, or resources, in "the calm lights of mild philosophy."

But whatever they may anticipate as the next measure of prudence and safety, they have explained nothing to the House. After rejecting the treaty, what is to be the next step? They must have foreseen what ought to be done,

they have doubtless resolved what to propose. Why, then, are they silent? Dare they not avow their plan of conduct, or do they wait till our progress toward confusion shall guide them in forming it?

Let me cheer the mind, weary, no doubt, and ready to despond on this prospect, by presenting another, which it is yet in our power to realize. Is it possible for a real American to look at the prosperity of this country without some desire for its continuance, without some respect for the measures which, many will say, produced, and all will confess, have preserved it? Will he not feel some dread that a change of system will reverse the scene? The well-grounded fears of our citizens in 1794 were removed by the treaty, but are not forgotten. Then they deemed war nearly inevitable, and would not this adjustment have been considered, at that day, as a happy escape from the calamity? The great interest and the general desire of our people was to enjoy the advantages of neutrality. This instrument, however misrepresented, affords America that inestimable security. The causes of our disputes are either cut up by the roots, or referred to a new negotiation after the end of the European war. This was gaining everything, because it confirmed our neutrality, by which our citizens are gaining everything. This alone would justify the engagements of the government. For, when the fiery vapors of the war lowered in the skirts of our horizon, all our wishes were concentrated in this one, that we might escape the desolation of the storm. This treaty, like a rainbow on the edge of the cloud, marked to our eyes the space where it was raging, and afforded, at the same time, the sure prognostic of fair weather. If we reject it, the vivid colors will grow pale, it will be a baleful meteor, portending tempest and war.

Let us not hesitate, then, to agree to the appropriation to carry it into faithful execution. Thus we shall save the faith of our nation, secure its peace, and diffuse the spirit of confidence and enterprise, that will augment its prosperity. The progress of wealth and improvement is wonderful, and some will think, too rapid. The field for exertion is fruitful and vast, and if peace and good government should be preserved, the acquisitions of our citizens are not

so pleasing as the proofs of their industry, as the instruments of their future success. The rewards of exertion go to augment its power. Profit is every hour becoming capital. The vast crop of our neutrality is all seed wheat, and is sown again to swell, almost beyond calculation, the future harvest of prosperity. And in this progress, what seems to be fiction is found to fall short of experience.

I rose to speak under impressions that I would have resisted if I could. Those who see me will believe that the reduced state of my health has unfitted me, almost equally, for much exertion of body or mind. Unprepared for debate, by careful reflection in my retirement, or by long attention here, I thought the resolution I had taken to sit silent was imposed by necessity, and would cost me no effort to maintain. With a mind thus vacant of ideas, and sinking, as I really am, under a sense of weakness, I imagined the very desire of speaking was extinguished by the persuasion that I had nothing to say. Yet when I come to the moment of deciding the vote, I start back with dread from the edge of the pit into which we are plunging. In my view, even the minutes I have spent in expostulation have their value, because they protract the crisis, and the short period in which alone we may resolve to escape it.

I have thus been led by my feelings to speak more at length than I had intended. Yet I have, perhaps, as little personal interest in the event as any one here. There is, I believe, no member who will not think his chance to be a witness of the consequences greater than mine. If, however, the vote should pass to reject, and a spirit should rise, as it will, with the public disorders, to make confusion worse confounded, even I, slender and almost broken as my hold upon life is, may outlive the government and Constitution of my country.

AUGUSTUS OCTAVIUS BACON

CHARACTER AND CAPACITY OF THE FILIPINOS

[Augustus Octavius Bacon, United States Senator from Georgia, was born in Bryan County, Ga., October 20, 1839. He graduated in arts at the University of Georgia in 1859, and in law at the same institution a year later. During the war of secession he joined the Confederate forces, and served as regimental adjutant and staff-captain. Senator Bacon has practised law at Macon since 1866. He was presidential elector in 1868, entered the Georgia House of Representatives in 1870, served for ten years, and was reelected 1892 and 1893. He was twice chosen Speaker of this House. He entered the National Senate in 1895. Mr. Bacon is a Democrat of the old style, and as an orator is clear and convincing. The following speech regarding the characteristics of the inhabitants of our new Western possessions was made in the United States Senate in 1901.]

MR. PRESIDENT: There has been a good deal said in this debate about the character of the Filipino people, and a good many things have been said which I think are contrary to the facts and unauthorized. I desire to put into the "Record," in order that they may appear in this debate, some estimates which have been made of this people by those who have had the best opportunity to judge of their capacity.

My purpose now is not to make anything like a speech, but simply to call attention to and to have put in the "Record" the testimonials which have been given by others as to the capacity of this people. The first person whose testimony I will give is that of Admiral Dewey.

On the twenty-seventh of June, 1898, in response to a telegram sent to him by the secretary of the navy, Admiral Dewey sent this reply, which will be found in the report of the secretary of the navy for 1898, volume 2, page 103:—

In my opinion these people are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races. DEWEY.

The Schurman Commission made a very elaborate examination into the question of the capacity of the Filipino people and their character, and the testimony takes up almost the entire second volume of the report of the Schurman Commission, where it set out the testimony of a great many witnesses, men of standing and capacity, and who have had opportunity to judge. The testimony is abundant in that volume as to the belief that these people are of sufficient intelligence and character to participate through representative bodies in the control of their own government.

Mr. President, in connection with what I read from Admiral Dewey, making comparison between the capacity and the intelligence of the Filipinos and the Cubans and awarding superiority to the Filipinos, I desire to say that I have asked a great many army officers, who have served both in Cuba and in the Philippines, what their estimate was, and without a single exception every army officer has given me the same opinion that Admiral Dewey expressed, that the Filipinos are superior in point of capacity and intelligence to the Cubans. Of course he is speaking of the average of the two peoples.

I want to say, Mr. President, if I may be pardoned for speaking of anything included in my personal experience in the Philippines, that my observation of that people satisfied me that they were a very far superior people to what I supposed they were before I went there. They are in some respects far superior to any other Asiatic people I have ever seen. They certainly have a very much higher regard for the outward observance of the decencies and modesties of life, as we understand them and as we observe them, immeasurably more so, than any other Asiatic race which it has ever been my fortune to see. What is the cause of that I do not know, unless it is the ameliorating influences of Christianity upon them; for it is a fact, Mr. President, that they are, speaking of them generally, a Christian people and a people of great devotion to their religion.

Something has been said here about the Filipinos having organized the only republic ever organized in Asia, and there has been controversy as to whether or not they did in fact organize a true republic. I do not propose to go into that question, but there is one thing that I think is absolutely true, and that is that they are the only Christian people in the whole of Asia, either on the mainland or on the islands of that continent. If there is any other Christian people in the whole of Asia, except the Filipinos, I do not know them. In that vast continent, embracing nearly one half of the entire human race, among them all there is no Christian people except the Filipinos. Of course I do not include in that statement the Russians who have gone to Siberia, because they are not an Asiatic people, but a European people.

Mr. Beveridge—Among those Christian people of whom the senator speaks, does he include the Moros?

Mr. Bacon—No.

Mr. Beveridge—Does the senator include the Igorrotes?

Mr. Bacon—With the permission of the senator, I will state exactly what I do include. I include the Visayans, who constitute some 2,600,000 people; I include the Tagalogs and others of the islands of Luzon and the neighboring islands, making in all, according to the report of the Schurman Commission, some 6,500,000 people. Those are the number whom I include.

Out of an estimated population of between 8,000,000 and 10,000,000 people, 6,500,000 of them are devoted Christians. There are more than twice as many Christians in the Philippines than there were people of every class in the thirteen colonies when they wrested their independence from England and founded this mighty nation. They do not belong to the denominations which are most popular —when I say "popular" I mean most numerous—in the United States, but they are none the less most devoted Christians, and the number of them is stated by the Schurman Commission to be 6,500,000. In everything except language they are one people—in religion, in blood, in dress, in habits, in domestic and social customs and observances, and in a strong feeling of common nationality.

Whatever was formerly lacking in this last regard, they have now been welded together in the white heat of four years' war.

But, Mr. President, in speaking thus of the Filipinos, I do not say this with any disposition of criticism or controversy, but simply in connection with the contention which I am endeavoring to make as to the propriety of our conferring upon those people liberal free institutions. The fact that they are a Christian people, a people devoted in their observances of the requirements of the Christian religion, a people whose Christianity has developed into the observances of the outward decencies and modesties of life, a people whose Christianity has developed into the virtues of home and society which characterize Europeans and Americans who are also Christians—all these things, I say, Mr. President, should appeal to us most strongly in dealing with this people, and influence us to confer upon them the freest institutions which it is possible for us to conceive them capable of appreciating and enjoying.

It does seem to me the very irony of fate—one that cannot fail to sadden any man who goes there and looks upon that people—the very irony of fate that the people who alone in all Asia share with us our religion, and worship with us at the same altar; the people who alone in all Asia have, through the influence of our religion, grown into the love of the social and domestic virtues, which are our richest inheritance; the people who have come nearest to us in our civilization, so far as personal characteristics and observances go; the people among whom this is seen even in the matter of their dress, which closely approaches that of Europeans and Americans, the only people who in all Asia even approximate the outward dress of civilized nations—I say it seems to me to be the very irony of fate that we, the great Christian republic of all the world, should have been brought into a situation—not criticising it now, but speaking of it simply as an unfortunate fact—that we should have been brought into a situation where there should have been between us this bloodshed, this terrible war, with its death and desolation and devastation. Mr. President, they are too far away, they belong to a different race, they can never be with us and a part of us, but every good senti-

ment appeals for their right to be a people, a nation free from yoke or thraldom.

Mr. President, I have felt that it was proper I should say this much for this people. I am not speaking now, as I say, in a controversial spirit or in a spirit of criticism for the purpose of attacking anything that has been done or anybody by whom it has been done. It is a very difficult thing in the heat of war and in the presence of the narration of outrages committed by some of that people upon our own soldiers, of barbarities and atrocities that nobody can possibly defend and everybody must condemn, and which I know the good people of that country condemn, it is extremely difficult for us to recognize the humanities of the situation; and it is with the hope that some one word I say may reach the American people in the presentation to them of the fact that—in spite of the horrors of war, in spite of all the prejudices which grow out of this conflict of life and death between man and man, and between people and people, in spite of all that—they are a people who should peculiarly commend themselves to us; that they are the only people in the whole of Asia that have the same religion that we have; that they are the only people in Asia that have the same outward regard for the decencies of life and modesties that we have and as we understand, and that they are the only people who have and prize the same social and domestic virtues that we have.

Not only so, but they should appeal to us most strongly to recognize the fact that a people of such religion, a people of such social and domestic virtues, a people with a love of country, which I believe is as strong in them as in any people in all the world, if they desire their liberty, if they desire an independent nationality, these are facts that should appeal to us most strongly, and we should not turn to them a deaf ear either through greed for wealth, the pride of conquest, or the lust of dominion.

There is one thing which appealed to me most pathetically in my intercourse with a great many people there. I take occasion to say that I had no intercourse with any except those who had recognized the sovereignty of the United States and were professedly loyal to it, who were not insurrectos—certainly not actively engaged in insurrec-

tion. But a fact which came to my knowledge—and I know it not only came to my knowledge, but to that of a great many others, because I have heard American officers speak of it—was this: That one great apprehension of that people is that the occupation of those islands by the American people means the extermination of themselves as a people.

That is the grave apprehension of that people. It is with them an ever-present haunting fear. I myself do not think to the extent of their fear the apprehension well founded. If the islands shall be exploited by Americans, I doubt not that the Filipinos will be pressed to the wall, and that under such circumstances they will never be the governing class in their own country. But I do not think the apprehension of utter extermination is well founded, solely for the reason that, on account of climatic conditions, the islands can never be inhabited by white people. If they could be inhabited by white people, I believe our occupation would have the effect of the practical extermination in time of the native population.

In conversing with a man who was not a politician and had never been a soldier, who was a man of property, a man of business, and who deprecated the war and wished it to cease, and was extremely anxious to that end that the authority of the United States should be recognized and that there should be no resistance to it, but who still thought that the Filipino people were entitled to their nationality, he said to me in a very dramatic manner, speaking of the condition in which the sovereignty of the United States would leave the islands and the effect upon the political status of its people: "I am not a Spaniard; I am not an American; I am not a Filipino. What am I?" indicating the utter hopelessness in that man's mind of the status of himself and his people, that he was no longer a Spaniard, that he could never become an American, and that as nationality was denied to his race he was not even a Filipino.

In this connection, while it is a little out of order for me to say it, I think one great defect in the pending bill is that there is no provision in it—at least there is not unless it has been made by amendment—under which any Filipino

can ever become a citizen of the United States even if he comes to America.

Mr. President, I did not expect to make this statement relative to the Filipinos when I rose. I rose principally for the purpose of putting these documents in the "Record" in order that they might be preserved in some degree of continuity as a part of this debate, and unconsciously I have drifted into this. But, sir, now that I have said I do not regret it, and I would that I could say more, for my heart is heavy with the fate of that unhappy people. I do feel that no man can go to the Philippine Islands, unless he is an extreme partisan, and fail to be interested in that people and to entertain a very great desire that there should be meted out to them much of kindness and much of indulgence and much of consideration, and that above all there should be remembered the extreme desire and anxiety of that people for an independent nationality. I would that to-day we might set their feet in the path that shall lead to it.

JOSEPH WALDEN BAILEY

THE PORTO RICO TARIFF

[Joseph Walden Bailey, an American political leader and orator, was born in Mississippi in 1863. He studied law and settled in Texas. He was elected to Congress from that state when twenty-seven years old. Elected a member of the National House of Representatives for ten years, during part of his period of service he was the leading Democrat "on the floor," and was nominated for the speakership by his party associates. He became a member of the United States Senate in 1901. The following speech, representing the anti-expansionist point of view regarding the Porto Rico tariff, was made in the United States Senate in 1900.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The majority of the committee* say: "Upon the whole we conclude, first, that upon reason and authority the term 'United States,' as used in the Constitution, has reference only to the states constituting the Federal Union, and does not include territory."

It is refreshing to find a Republican committee talking once more about the "Federal Union." We have been so long accustomed to hear them talk about the "nation" and express a contempt for the "Federal Union," that it is some compensation for this debate to hear them employing the earlier language of the republic.

Is it true, either upon reason or authority, that the term "United States" includes only the sovereign states and excludes the territories?

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, that term is used, as the committee itself has well said, with several different meanings. It is sometimes used to denote the states of the Union; it is sometimes used in a geographical sense to describe the area of the republic, and at other times it is

* The committee appointed to consider the Porto Rico tariff.

used to signify the government organized by the Constitution.

Unless there are plain words or plain intent in the Constitution to restrict the meaning of the term, it ought not to be restricted, because to separate the states from the territories under the designation "United States" is an effort to apply, as is proposed by this bill, different principles of jurisprudence to the two; and that, sir, is contrary to the genius of our institutions. A republic is, in its very nature, incapable of maintaining permanent dependencies; and this truth, until these last twenty-four months, has been accepted by all schools of political thought in this country. I defy you to find a respectable authority, until within the last two years, which has even ventured to affirm that a colonial policy is in harmony with our system of government.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of the committee, in confirmation of this statement, to an eminent authority read by my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. Hopkins], but read only so far as suited the particular contention which he then had in his mind, and it was not concluded. Had he read the entire paragraph, it would have set the seal of the great chancellor's condemnation upon this new and startling proposition to colonize distant and unknown lands. Chancellor Kent, in his "Commentaries," declares:—

> Such a state of absolute sovereignty on the one hand and of absolute dependence on the other is not congenial with the free and independent spirit of our institutions; and the establishment of distant territorial governments ruled according to our will and pleasure would have a very natural tendency, as all proconsular governments have, to abuse and oppression. [Applause.]

Mr. Webster, in a passage that has been well quoted by my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall], declares that—

> an arbitrary government may have territorial governments in distant possessions, because an arbitrary government may rule its distant territories by different laws and different systems. Russia may govern the Ukraine and the Caucasus and Kamchatka by different codes or

ukases. We can do no such thing. They must be of us, part of us, or else estranged. I think I see, then, in progress what is to disfigure and deform the Constitution. . . . I think I see a course adopted that is likely to turn the Constitution under which we live into a deformed monster, into a curse rather than a blessing, into a great frame of unequal government, not founded on popular presentation, but founded on the grossest inequalities, and I think if it go on—for there is a great danger that it will go on—that this government will be broken up.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the Republican party will pause before committing itself to a policy which the greatest statesman of its own school has declared would "turn the Constitution into a curse and break up the government."

If it were possible to find an authority which addresses itself with greater force to gentlemen on the other side than the solemn warning of Webster, reenforced by the commentary of Kent, it would be the language of one reared under the system which we are now urged to adopt. I have in my hand that remarkable contribution to modern literature which the author modestly calls a "Sketch of Cæsar." It was written by Mr. Froude; and surely his testimony against a colonial government will weigh with the Anglomaniacs, who doubtless remember what an earnest defender he has been of English oppression against the Irish race. In the preface Mr. Froude uses these words, which I will ask the clerk to read from his desk.

The clerk read as follows:—

To the student of political history and to the English student above all others, the conversion of the Roman republic into a military empire commands a peculiar interest. Notwithstanding many differences, the English and the Romans essentially resemble one another. The early Romans possessed the faculty of self-government beyond any people of whom we have historical knowledge, with the exception of ourselves. In virtue of their temporal freedom, they became the most powerful nation in the known world; and their liberties perished only when Rome became the mistress of conquered races, to whom she was unable or unwilling to extend her privileges. If England was similarly supreme, if all rival powers were eclipsed by her or laid under her feet, the imperial tendencies, which are as strongly marked in us as our love of liberty, might lead us over the same course to the same end. If there can be one lesson which history clearly teaches it is this, that free na-

tions cannot govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to share their own constitution, the constitution itself will fall to pieces from mere incompetence for its duties.

If it be true, Mr. Chairman, as declared by all these great authorities, that an attempt to govern subject provinces is at war with the spirit of a free republic, where will the majority of this committee find its justification for asserting that "upon reason and authority the term 'United States' does not include our territories?"

But, sir, there is a still more conclusive answer than any which has been read—an answer that is not political or historical or literary, but one from the lips of the greatest chief justice who ever served this or any other republic in the history of the world. Although I agree with but little of his political philosophy, the services, the character, and the ability of John Marshall entitle his memory to be revered and his words to be respected. The authority which I shall read is not only a judicial opinion sanctioned by Marshall's great name, but it was the unanimous judgment of the Supreme Court. With that highest tribunal known to our law explicitly and unequivocally declaring that the term "United States" does include our territories, I think this committee will find it difficult to explain why they have reported a different conclusion to this House. What opinion of our courts have they cited to sustain their report? What learned judge supports their contention? Not one; and against their single and unsupported assertion I offer these words of Chief Justice Marshall. He says:—

Does this term—meaning the "United States"—designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer.

He had not lived long enough to see this remarkable report of this remarkable committee [applause on the Democratic side], or perhaps he would not have ventured to say that the question admits of but one answer.

It is the name given to our great republic, which is composed of states and territories. The District of Columbia, or the territory west of the Missouri, is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania.

I defy any gentleman on either side of the aisle to take an hour, a day, or week, and write out a more explicit contradiction of the statement contained in that committee's report than is found in these words of Chief Justice Marshall. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Let us compare them. The committee say:—

> That upon reason and authority the term "United States," as used in the Constitution, has reference only to the states that constitute the Federal Union, and does not include the territories.

Marshall says that the "United States" is the name given to our great republic, which is composed of states and territories, and includes our territories as much as the State of Maryland or the State of Pennsylvania. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen, whose judgment will you follow—that of the greatest lawyers that ever adorned our bench, or the political report of the Hon. Mr. Payne of New York? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

That is not the only case in which this same doctrine is asserted. In Cross *vs.* Harrison the court says:—

> By the ratification of the treaty California became a part of the United States.

California could not become a part of the United States if these gentlemen are right, until it became a state of the Federal Union, and therefore if California became a part of the United States by the ratification of the treaty, as stated, by the Supreme Court, this report must be wrong, because the ratification of the treaty only made it a territory, which is not, according to the report, a part of the United States.

Who is right—the unanimous Supreme Court or this divided committee? Who is most apt to have understood the Constitution—those judges, removed from the passions and perplexities of the political question that now confronts us, or these politicians who three weeks ago introduced a bill for free trade and now report a substitute which is exactly opposite? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I shall submit the first conclusion of the Committee on

JOSEPH WALDEN BAILE

Photogravure after a photograph

Ways and Means without further argument, because it is itself a mere abstraction, and is of no practical importance except as a precedent for what follows it. The meat of their report is the second conclusion of the committee, which is: "that the power of Congress with respect to legislations for the territories is plenary."

In order to arrive at what the committee means by "plenary," we have only to read the speeches of the gentlemen who have joined in that report. By "plenary" they mean that it is outside of and above the Constitution. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dalzell], who is, I will do him the justice to say, one of the greatest lawyers on that side, as well as one of the ablest men in the House, in response to the direct question says that under its plenary power over the territories Congress can establish free trade between the United States and Arizona, and at the same time maintain a protective tariff between New Mexico and the United States. In other words, he meets the question broadly and fairly, and affirms the power of Congress to govern these territories, not only outside of the Constitution, but to govern them contrary to its express prohibitions. Is that position defensible either as a matter of reason or as a matter of authority?

Perhaps, before we undertake to determine the extent of the power of Congress over the territories of the United States, it might be well enough for us to occupy a few moments in ascertaining the source from which Congress derives whatever power it may possess. That it derives its power from the Constitution all men have admitted until this remarkable report was submitted to the House. The differences heretofore have been as to what part of the Constitution vested Congress with its power over the territories. Some have asserted that the power comes from that provision which authorizes us "to dispose of and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States"; whereas others, and with better reason, as it seems to me, have insisted that the power is derived from that clause of the Constitution which authorizes Congress to admit new states into the Union. The latter is my own view; and I will detain the House to consider it for a moment.

These two clauses are a part of the same article. Indeed, they are a part of the same section, and one immediately follows the other. Section 3 of Article IV provides:

> New states may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new state shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other state, nor any state be formed by the junction of two or more states, or parts of states, without the consent of the legislatures of the states concerned, as well as of the Congress.
>
> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state.

It will be remembered that when the Constitution was framed there were boundary-line disputes and contentions between certain of the states over the rightful ownership of vast tracts of land. It will also be remembered that a large body of land had been ceded by Virginia and other states under the old Confederation to the government which immediately preceded the present government of the United States.

These lands were considered in two respects. They were considered with reference to their future population and admission into the Union as states, and also as mere matters of property. The first provision of the Constitution dealt with them in the shape of future states, and authorized Congress to admit them into the Union. The second provision dealt with them as mere matters of property, and authorized Congress to make whatever disposition of them it might choose. The power is "to dispose of and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting" what? Not respecting future states of this Union, but "respecting *the territory or other property* belonging to the United States." The article "the" and the singular "territory" plainly imply that the framers of the Constitution in the provision treated the question purely as one of property; and if these words left any doubt, that doubt must be resolved when we read the preceding words, "to dispose of," and the succeeding words, "or other property belonging to the United States."

The authority conferred by this paragraph of the Con-

stitution is a mere trader's license to sell, to encumber, to lease, to survey, or to do anything with respect to the land itself that an individual owner of it might have done. Who can suppose that the great men who framed our Constitution intended to confer the power of life and death, the power of freedom and slavery, upon Congress in connection with this authority to dispose of the property belonging to the United States? I might have less hesitation in asserting this to be my view of the Constitution if it were not the same view that was asserted with such powerful force of reasoning in the celebrated case of Sandford against Scott. Judge Taney, in the course of his elaborate and exhaustive opinion, asserts most positively that this section of the Constitution is a mere trader's license, and does not confer upon us our power to govern territories.

As Congress has the power to admit new states into the Union, it follows naturally and safely that it shall have the power to govern our territories in a manner suitable to prepare them for their admission; and that is precisely what Judge Marshall meant when, at the case of the Insurance Company against Canter, he asserted that over these territories Congress exercised the power of both the general and the state governments. As the territory is merely the initiative stage of statehood, not yet ready by reason of population, or other conditions, to become a state, it must be governed, not with the view proclaimed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Grosvenor], "of making all the money that can be made out of it," but with a view to its ultimately becoming a state of the Union. Adopt that construction of the Constitution, and all difficulties disappear. It is not only the one announced in the Dred Scott case, but it is consistent with the statement of Chief Justice Marshall in the Canter case. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Not only did Judge Taney declare that we govern the territories of the United States under our power to admit them as states into the Union, but, sir, he also declared that we had no right to acquire and govern colonies; and in this opinion he was following the argument with which Mr. Jefferson was finally persuaded to treat the purchase of the Louisiana territory as an exercise of proper constitutional authority. Almost every gentleman who has spoken

upon the other side of this question, either during this debate or since the general policy of territorial acquisition has been under discussion, has been at pains to tell us how Jefferson bought the Louisiana territory, although he believed that in doing so he had acted without the warrant of the Constitution. That is true; but it is not the whole truth, as the people are entitled to know it.

It is true that when Mr. Jefferson negotiated the treaty by which we obtained that vast tract of land, he did not believe that he had the power to make that transaction a valid and binding one upon this country; and he likened his conduct to that of an agent who had exceeded his authority for the benefit of his principal, relying upon his principal to ratify it; and he recognized the invalidity of what he had done unless it was ratified and confirmed by the principal as whose agent he had acted. With his own hand Mr. Jefferson drew two constitutional amendments to ratify and confirm the purchase of the Louisiana territory; but his doubt as to the constitutionality of his act was not shared by his attorney-general and many of the greatest lawyers of that day. They contended that under its power to admit new states into the Union, Congress could acquire the territory out of which to make new states; and finally Mr. Jefferson yielded to that view of the question.

The treaty under which Louisiana had come to us provided expressly that its people should become our citizens, and that their country should be divided up into states and admitted as equal members of our Federal Union; therefore, stating the Louisiana precedent as strongly as it can be stated, it does not contradict, but rather confirms, the statement of Judge Taney when he declared:—

> There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States, or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure; nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way except by the admission of new states. That power is plainly given: and if a new state is admitted it needs no further legislation by Congress, because the Constitution itself defines the relative rights and powers and duties of the state, and the citizens of the state, and the Federal Government. But no power is given to acquire a territory to be held and governed permanently in that character.

It is acquired to become a state, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority; and as the propriety of admitting a new state is committed to the sound discretion of Congress, the power to acquire territory for that purpose, to be held by the United States until it is in a suitable condition to become a state upon an equal footing with the other states, must rest upon this same discretion.

Mr. Chairman, it must be remembered that Judge Taney's declaration in the Dred Scott case, that the "Federal Government possesses no power to hold colonies," was not only concurred in by all of those who agreed to the judgment of the court; but it was expressly indorsed by one of the dissenting judges, Mr. McLean, and tacitly agreed to by the other dissenting justice, Mr. Curtis, who did not attempt to controvert it in his elaborate dissenting opinions. That decision, although frequently discounted by reason of the unfortunate question with which it dealt, in so far as it touches the power of Congress to govern colonies, has never been overruled or even qualified by the Supreme Court. Then, sir, if it is true that this government has no power to acquire territory to be held as a colony, how, in the name of common sense, can Congress have the power to govern any territory as a colony?

But there is a more decisive argument than the authority of the Dred Scott case. If the power of Congress over the territories of the United States is plenary, as these gentlemen assert, and if it is not bound by the Constitution, then, sir, it can establish an official religion such as its conscience might approve, and it can prohibit the free exercise of any other religion in the territory. Can the gentlemen affirming that proposition produce a line from any law book to support it? Without detaining the committee with an argument of my own upon it, I am willing to submit it to the test of judicial authority, and I will agree to surrender this whole question unless I can produce an opinion of the Supreme Court which expressly negatives that proposition.

The third conclusion of the committee is "that under that power Congress may prescribe different rules of duty for Porto Rico from those prescribed for the United States."

Let us see. From what source does Congress derive its power to lay and collect taxes, duties, and imposts? Every gentleman on that side will admit that it derives it from

the Constitution. It is the first power expressly granted to Congress by the Constitution. In Section 8 it is provided that—

> the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but [now mark the limitation] all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

It would be impossible to express a limitation more plainly than is done in that provision; and the only way by which these gentlemen can escape that injunction of uniformity is to return to the subterfuge that the United States does not include the territories. No distinction is attempted by the committee on account of the peculiar situation of Porto Rico, and none could be sustained if attempted. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dalzell] concedes that the same rule which applies to Porto Rico applies also to Arizona and to New Mexico.

I would be glad to debate this question first as a matter of principle, but a glance at the clock admonishes me that I have not the time, and I must therefore content myself with invoking again the decisions of our courts. The very question has been presented to the Supreme Court on two different occasions: First, in the case of Loughborough *vs.* Blake, and again in the case of Cross *vs.* Harrison. One was decided when John Marshall was chief justice, the other after Roger B. Taney had succeeded him; and in both cases the court was unanimous in its opinion. If this very proposition to lay a different rate of duty upon goods which are carried into Porto Rico from that which is laid upon goods which are brought into the port of New York had been before the court, the following language of Chief Justice Marshall could not have been more to the point. He says:—

> The eighth section of the first article gives to Congress the "power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises" for the purposes hereinafter mentioned. This grant is general, without limitation as to place. It consequently extends to all places over which the government extends. If this could be doubted, the doubt is removed by the subsequent words which modify the grant. Those words are: "But all the

duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." It will not be contended that the modification of the power extends to places to which the power itself does not extend. The power, then, to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises may be exercised and must be exercised throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great republic, which is composed of states and territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania, and it is not less necessary on the principles of our Constitution that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises should be observed in the one than in the other.

Further on in this same case, and while addressing himself to the argument upon another phase of it, he again lays down the same doctrine in these words:—

Yet it is admitted that the Constitution not only allows but enjoins the government to extend the ordinary revenue system to this District. If it be said that the principle of uniformity, established in the Constitution, secures the District from oppression in the imposition of indirect taxes, it is not less true that the principle of apportionment, also established in the Constitution, secures the District from any oppressive exercise of the power to lay and collect.

And thus, for the second time, in this same opinion, the great chief justice declares that the rule of uniformity must be observed by Congress in laying duties, imposts, and excises in the District of Columbia and in the territories, as well as in the sovereign states. No gentleman on that side who has any regard for his reputation as a lawyer will venture to deny that these statements, taken from the opinion of Judge Marshall, are applicable to the question now before us; nor will one of them rise in his place and contend that the opinion in the case of Loughborough *vs.* Blake has been overruled, modified, or even doubted.

What excuse, then, will the committee render to this House and to the country for asking us to fly in the face of a decision of our highest court rendered by its greatest chief justice, and which has stood unchallenged for eighty years? Do they expect the intelligent people of this re-

public to excuse their palpable disregard of the Constitution and the law on the ground of partisan emergency? I am aware, sir, that the people will forgive much to the spirit of a sturdy partisanship; but I do not believe that they will tolerate this reckless and unnecessary violation of the plain letter of the Constitution and the well-established and unquestioned decision of the court.

The power to lay and collect duties, all men agree, is as wide as is the jurisdiction of the republic. Then how can any one deny that the limitations on that power follow it wherever it is exercised? [Renewed applause.] You will collect these duties in Porto Rico under a particular clause of the Constitution; yet, sir, while asserting its authority you deny its limitation, and in denying this limitation you ignore the authority of Marshall and of Taney.

> The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania, and it is not less necessary on the principles of our Constitution that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises should be observed in the one than in the other.

So said John Marshall. What say you, gentlemen of the Republican party?

To land foreign goods within the United States at any place out of a collection district, if allowed, would be a violation of that provision of the Constitution which enjoins that all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States. So said the Supreme Court in Cross *vs.* Harrison; and can party exigency establish a different doctrine?

I understand and appreciate the situation of the gentlemen who are supporting this bill. They realize the utter impossibility of governing colonial possessions according to the Constitution of the United States, and they have resolved upon the dangerous course of boldly setting the Constitution aside. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] If I could derive a personal satisfaction from any circumstance which I deemed a misfortune to my country, I would rejoice in their decision, because it abundantly confirms what I said in the very beginning of this controversy. Eighteen months ago, when the fever of war and

conquest was in the blood of our people, when men talked only of battles and victories, when the music of the fife and drum had aroused our martial spirit, I did not yield to this general excitement; but in the midst of it I stood unmoved, and warned my countrymen that the Constitution of this free republic could not be applied to the government of colonies. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] When emotional statesmen cried out to know who would take down the flag, I dared to say that I would take it down from any land where the Constitution of my country could not follow it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen of the Republican party, are you ready to present to the world the anomaly of a government restrained by a Constitution in one quarter of the globe, and yet possessed of despotic power in other regions of the earth? How long will our Constitution shield us and our children if we withhold its protection from the meanest under our jurisdiction? It was ordained to limit the powers of this government at all places and over all men; the greatest are not exempt from its limitations, nor can its protection be denied to the humblest. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Under this new and strange philosophy which we are now invited to embrace, the people of our new possessions will neither perform its obligations nor enjoy its blessings. To them those sacred guaranties which we hold more precious than our life are meaningless. Their houses may be searched; the altars of their religion may be leveled to the ground; soldiers may be quartered on them in times of peace, and when they have peaceably assembled to petition for a redress of their grievances, they can be dispersed at the point of the sword. They can be arrested without a warrant; they can be tried without a jury, or condemned without a trial. The greed of one American proconsul may strip them of their property, and the lust of another may despoil their homes. And yet, sir, against these unspeakable atrocities they cannot invoke those great provisions which our fathers deemed the heritage of all freemen. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen, are you ready to divide our people into citizens and subjects—half monarchy and half republic?

Let me borrow the immortal words of Lincoln, and applying them to this new condition, let me remind you that this republic cannot endure half slave and half free. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Either we must all be citizens or else in time we shall become subjects. I did not want these alien and inferior races, and I fervently pray that we may yet be delivered from the impossible task of assimilating and governing them. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But, sir, if you will take them, you must make them a part of us; we must share their destiny with them, and they must share their destiny with us, for there is no place under our form of government for that wretched creature without citizenship. Every man who stands beneath the ample folds of that flag which adorns yonder speaker's stand shall have the right to face the world, and with that prouder than Roman boast upon his lips, proclaim, "I am an American citizen." [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR

ON THE BOER WAR

[Arthur James Balfour, an English statesman, Conservative and Imperialist, was born, 1848, in Scotland. He is the eldest son of the late James Maitland Balfour, who married Lady Blanche Gascoigne Cecil, daughter of the second Marquis of Salisbury, father of the late marquis. Mr. Balfour is distinguished for intellectual attainments of a high order, and has the true Scottish taste for logic and metaphysics. He was educated at Eton, and graduated in due course from Trinity College, Cambridge. He has accepted honorary doctorates from six other universities, and is a F.R.S. Mr. Balfour entered Parliament as member for Hertford in 1874, and became private secretary to the Marquis of Salisbury, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. He attended the Berlin Congress on a special mission in 1878, and was created Privy Councilor in 1885. In 1886 he was appointed to a seat in the Cabinet. He became First Lord of the Treasury, and leader in the House of Commons in 1891. He has written many valuable works on religion from the standpoint of reason. He is at present M.P. for the Eastern District of Manchester. On the retirement of the Marquis of Salisbury, at the conclusion of the Boer War, Mr. Balfour became Premier, 1902. As a speaker Mr. Balfour is clear, cogent, and convincing. He is not addicted to flights of rhetoric, but sometimes seasons his argument with a spice of irony. The address given here was made to his own constituency in Manchester in 1900, during the progress of the Boer War.]

IN order that we may judge fairly of the course of events which have led up to the position in which we find ourselves, let us attempt to do that which is not always very easy to do—I mean, let us attempt to throw ourselves in imagination at the present moment into the position in which we were, one and all, six or eight months ago. What then was our view of the South African difficulty? The difficulty was, no doubt, there with us, as it has been present with us all throughout the term of office of this govern-

ment, and as it had been present throughout the term of office of our predecessors and their predecessors again. But there was no ground for feeling that these perennial difficulties, whatever their ultimate outcome might be, were sufficient to daunt our determination that the controversy which had arisen should be settled once and for all; but which will not be settled easily, immediately, without further difficulty, without further bloodshed. Well, what was, in our view, in the general view, the position of affairs? We knew that there was this constant friction between the Transvaal government and successive British governments. We knew that they were always fretting against the bit; that they desired nothing so much as to tear up all the provisions in the conventions between the two countries which limited their autonomy, and to claim, among all the nations of the world, an absolutely independent place. That we knew. We knew, further, that there was a progressive ill treatment of uitlanders, mostly men of our own speech and of our own blood; and we knew, further, that there were progressive armaments, purchased at the cost of taxes laid upon foreign and principally British industry, British capital, and British labor. We found ourselves in this condition of things hampered diplomatically at every turn by the raid—that most unfortunate and ill-omened enterprise—and it found us also determined to require ultimately from the Transvaal a treatment of British subjects not grossly or scandalously different from the treatment that we accord to men of Dutch speech and Dutch blood in the freedom of an English self-governing colony. Now, of course, that position was a dangerous one, and, of course, it was a position which at any moment might have led to hostilities. It was dangerous, because of the misgovernment, and because of the corruption—of the corruption, as I have told you, fed by British industry, of the misgovernment of which British subjects were the victims; and it was dangerous because of the magnitude of the armaments which the Transvaal had made and because of that overweening military pride which, to our loss, and still much more to their eternal loss, had entirely turned their heads and blinded their eyes to the military power of this country. But while it is true that all thoughtful observers

regarded the situation as one which had within it elements of peril, and while a large number of persons thought that as time went on a struggle between the pretensions of the Boers and the duties of the imperial government would bring about a conflict, I do not believe that in anybody's mind, and certainly not in the mind of the government, was it regarded as inevitable, or even in any high degree probable, that before the autumn had drawn to its close the Orange Free State and the Transvaal would be involved in hostilities with this country. I recapitulate these facts, familiar to all, because from day to day, when we are anxiously awaiting the telegrams, when our minds are absorbed in the varying fortunes of the war, we are too apt to consider too little the circumstances which led up to the present state of things; and some of us, though I think not many, may be tempted to judge harshly the government responsible for the conduct both of civil and military affairs. Now, why did not the government, knowing that armaments were being accumulated in the Transvaal, enter a protest two years ago, and declare that either the accumulating of armaments, which could only be directed against this country and its colonies, should cease, or else we should regard it as a cause of quarrel between us and the Boer government? There is a conclusive reason, and a melancholy reason, why that argument should not have been used against the Boer government. Our hands were tied and our mouths were closed at the time by the raid. How could we say to the Boer government, "You disarm; you have nothing to fear from us"? How, I say, could we use that argument when three years ago an expedition composed of our countrymen had made an onslaught—a feeble and ineffective onslaught, it is true, but still an onslaught —on the Boer government? We were helpless in the face of that argument. It was always open for the Boer government to say, "These arms which we are accumulating, these munitions of war which we are buying, are intended not for aggression, but for protection, for self-defense against a second raid upon our territory." You will see that the argument that I wish to use is this—that we entered upon this war insufficiently prepared to deal on the spot with the military situation which we had to face, and

looking back impartially, I say that the steps we took were, in the state of our knowledge, sufficient steps, and that the policy we took was one which ought to commend itself to the impartial judgment of the country.

We are attacked, indeed, now for having done too little. The very men who now attack us are sometimes the men who six months ago attacked us in terms not less bitter for having done too much. Now, just consider what course a government ought to pursue which is engaged in a difficult and delicate negotiation, which is anxious as we were for peace; which, indeed, thinks war possible, as we thought it possible, but does not think it probable, as we did not think it probable. I say the course that such a government would take was, in the first place to abstain from unnecessary menace, which might hamper, and fatally hamper, the course of peaceful negotiation; but while abstaining from preparation of the nature of menace, it would at the same time do that which it thought necessary to meet defensively the eventuality of war, if, as was improbable, but possible, war should be the ultimate issue of the negotiations. That was the course we pursued. If we were wrong in thinking war improbable, we erred with the great mass of opinion instructed upon South African affairs. I do not say that you might not find here and there some prophet of evil who told us that, as soon as the grass grew, the Boers and their horses would be in the field; but if you consider, as I had to consider, the balance of competent opinion on the South African question, while few men were rash enough to hazard the prophecy that the South African question would ultimately culminate in war, for the present, at all events, the probability was that we should obtain such rights for the uitlanders in the Transvaal as should at least tide over the present year and the present difficulty, until, perhaps, some period arrived when, either by accident or by design, it might suit the Boer leaders to precipitate a struggle, from which they hoped, but vainly hoped, to reap so much for their national advantage. And, observe, this was not a question on which the government had, could have, or ever pretended to have, special means of information. There have been, and may be, European questions on which the public cannot be taken into the con-

fidence of the government of the day. The government of the day may know perfectly and secretly facts about the intents of this or that foreign sovereign or government which impose upon them a certain policy, but which they cannot communicate, at all events in any fulness of detail, to their fellow countrymen. But in this case there were no secrets. Everybody was on an equality. The man in the street knew as much as the man in the Cabinet—very often thought he knew a great deal more—and if the government, or, as in this particular case I should not speak of any member of the government but myself, if I individually held a view which events have proved to be an erroneous view—namely, that peace was a possibility, and that by strenuously attempting to come to an understanding with the Boer government peace could be secured—if, I say, we or I made that mistake, we made it in common with the great mass, not only of public opinion in this country, but of that portion of public opinion who knew most of South African affairs.

But I suppose I ought not to abstain from going a little more into detail, into the criticism upon the warlike preparation—warlike material, I ought to say, perhaps—and upon the army which we have sent into the field. Though it is rather a technical subject, I am emboldened to deal with it, because I am speaking in an artillery hall lent us by the generosity of the colonel of the Manchester Artillery Volunteers, and because I shall therefore have, at all events, some members of the audience who are professionally interested in this controversy which has been raised with regard to the British artillery in the recent military transactions. Now, I think we have been told by some that the British army has been sent into the field armed with a weapon so obsolete and so inferior that practically our brave soldiers have been handed over to their better-armed opponents as sheep going to the slaughter. I believe that to be a profound and complete delusion. I have inquired into the subject, and what I say now is not intended to prejudice any inquiry, but to give you, fairly and honestly, the conclusions at which I have arrived, having given such attention as I have been able to give. Now, please, remember that when you are dealing with the artil-

lery which is to accompany a field force, you are dealing with a kind of artillery which is nothing if it is not mobile; and, please, further remember that mobility in this connection means something different from mere power of being moved from one place to another. It means, specifically, in the case of horse artillery, that it is so mobile that it can accompany cavalry; and in the case of field artillery that it can accompany infantry, and even go faster than infantry; but that it can accompany it under any circumstances, however rapid the movement of that infantry may be. That is the object of a mobile field force, and you cannot have guns attaining that degree of mobility without making those guns and ammunition a compromise. What is a compromise? A compromise is an arrangement by which certain recognized advantages are given up in order to obtain certain other and compensating advantages, and the inevitable effect of a compromise is, that under certain conditions the advantage may be less than the thing you have given up, or more valuable than the quality which you have attained by that surrender. So it is in the case of these guns. No doubt if you had a less mobile gun you would have a gun which carried further. No doubt if you had a different kind of ammunition, if you used shell instead of shrapnel—you will forgive these technical expressions—again you would have a further range; but you cannot get these qualities without sacrificing either the rapid and easy mobility of your guns, or the destructive power of your projectile under the circumstance in which that projectile is most likely to be useful. For instance, let us say that ordinary shell will go somewhere between five thousand and six thousand yards; shrapnel, perhaps, will not—only between four thousand and five thousand. Quite true, but the shrapnel is far more destructive at the range you use it than shell could ever be, and I believe that almost all foreign countries—German and French as well as our own—have decided that it is better to lose something in the way of range and use shrapnel than to lose something in destructive power and use shell. That is the whole case, put very briefly and in a nutshell. The guns sent with Sir George White's force were intended to be mobile guns with a mobile force. They were not intended to be guns of the

kind to defend a beleaguered fortress, in which General White found himself, most unhappily and most unfortunately, entangled. Do not you believe—until you have it on better evidence than I am able to find—do not believe that your soldiers were sent from this country into a field army with a worse gun than that the French government or the German government would use under similar circumstances. It is quite true that the course of the war has demonstrated a fact not realized before the war began—namely, that in addition to mobile guns, it was useful, and, indeed, necessary to have a large number of guns of greater range and less mobility. Those guns have been sent out, are being sent out, and will be sent out in abundant numbers, and whatever criticism may hereafter pass, either upon the government, or upon the war office, or upon our generals in the field, or upon any branch of the service connected with the war, I do not believe it will ever be proclaimed that the army we have sent into the field is inadequately equipped with any modern requirement or any requirement which the progress of invention has shown to be necessary in the case of a modern army.

It will be remembered that while the volunteers and imperial yeomanry are rendering a great service to the country by what they are doing, the first duty after all—I mean the fundamental and primary duty after all—of the yeomanry is to carry out that function for which they were called into existence, and that function is the function of home defense. The number of persons who, by their circumstances, as well as by their wishes and accomplishments, are thoroughly qualified to go, I believe to be amply sufficient for any requirement the government may have in South Africa. But I do beg of that great majority of the volunteer force which, from the nature of the case, cannot go, and, in my judgment, ought not to go—I beg them to remember that they have within these shores a great duty to perform. I tell them now, with every sense of responsibility, that the duty which devolves upon them of keeping up their numbers and training themselves to the highest pitch of perfection is a duty which was never more required of them than it is at the moment when this vast mass of regular troops are withdrawn from these shores. It is not

merely he who goes who performs a patriotic duty; it is also he who stays behind, and does, it may be the duller, certainly the less exciting and more inglorious, but not necessarily the less useful or the less laborious task of working up our great volunteer forces to the highest pitch of perfection, who deserves well of his country. I need not say that I do not make these observations with a view to discourage any young fellow whose patriotism, let me say whose love of fighting, whose courage, whose love of adventure, whose wish to serve the interests of the empire, call him abroad. He is the last man I wish to discourage. I wish him Godspeed. I think we all owe him a debt of gratitude. But there are countless others whose circumstances call them to a sphere of utility and activity not less necessary for national welfare and national preservation, and I would beg them to remember that they, equally with their more fortunate brethren, are carrying out a great work for their country.

Now, you will observe that I have been wise enough to discuss nothing but the war and the antecedents of the war. Nothing else at this moment, I believe, would have a chance of interesting this vast meeting. But I hope you will notice that I have abstained carefully and completely from doing any one of three things. I have abstained altogether from any, I will not say criticism, but even comment upon the action of our generals in the field. We have given them a free hand, we have chosen them to the best of our ability, we have given them and are giving them all the material assistance which it is in our power to give. That having been done, in my judgment we should leave them to work out the problem entrusted to them to the best of their capacity, and while speaking as a member of the government, I absolutely deprecate hampering their movements by orders from home. While I think it desirable to state that it has never occurred to the government to issue such orders at any period of the campaign, I think I may make an appeal to the public on their side not to abstain from fair comment, but as far as possible to remember that they are dealing with men who not only have a problem of exceeding difficulty to deal with, but who, if criticised, are not in a position to defend themselves.

The second thing I have abstained from is an appeal to you, or through you to the country, to persevere in this contest. I should regard such an appeal as an insult. I do not think this country needs any spur which I or any other public man can give it to persist in a policy, on the successful completion of which depends for all time the position which this nation is to hold among the nations of the world. We have been slow, the nation has been slow, the government has been slow, to see precisely the inevitable trend of affairs in South Africa. It may be that the government was to blame, it may be that the nation itself was to blame; but though we have been slow, now we have made up our minds, we shall be constant. Now that we have forced on us the conclusion that the states on whom we wasted so much diplomacy have seriously intended the destruction of our rule in South Africa; now we have been forced to understand that this war is not caused merely by a controversy as to whether the uitlanders shall or shall not have the franchise, but was, on the contrary, founded upon a deeper jealousy of our presence in South Africa, which would never have tolerated that presence a moment longer than necessity appeared to require; now that we have been forced to the conclusion that the war we are now engaged upon is a war simply of self-defense, and on the issue of that war will depend whether there shall be a British empire in South Africa; now that that conclusion has sunk deep in the minds of the people—and I do not think that anything will eradicate it—through good fortune or evil, through good report or evil report, we shall pursue, unwavering to the end, a policy which at all events shall secure among its results that no such war in South Africa shall ever be waged again. The third thing from which I have abstained is prophecy. I am not attempting to minimize the disappointments of the past; I am not going to flatter your ears with prophecies of good fortune in the immediate future. I know not what is in store for us. It may be that Boer opposition will collapse sooner than many of us dare to hope for. It may be, on the other hand, that we have still to go through a period of great darkness and great difficulty before the light of success shines assuredly before our eyes. I make no prophecies about the future,

but under Providence I rely upon the high courage of my countrymen; and I know, whatever it is we have to go through, we shall go through it with a bold heart and cheerful spirit, knowing that a bold heart and a cheerful spirit are destined in the end inevitably to win.

I have been obliged to admit that the war has been in many respects up to the present time fraught with disappointments of the expectations formed by those most qualified by expert knowledge to decide; but do not let it be supposed that I for one moment suppose that the war, even as it is at the present moment, has not been fruitful in great deeds and great blessings to this empire. Reflect how it has brought together all shades of political opinion, all classes of prejudice, all convictions in this country; how all have united; how everybody has in his measure done his best to support the cause which he believes not only to be the cause of his country, but of righteousness and civilization. Think again of the thrill of sympathy which has gone from the mother country, the heart of the empire, to every one of its extremities, and which has been returned, as it were, from the extremities again to reenforce the heart of the empire—from all our colonies, from all our dependencies, from Canada, Australia, New Zealand, from India, from the great princes of India, our feudatories. All are agreed upon a common object, all are moved by a common aim, all are prepared to make common sacrifices. Is that nothing? I think it is everything. Does not the blood tingle and the pulse beat quicker to read such feats as have been performed by the squadrons of our colonies in the successful little fight the other day on the west of the theater of war, and again on the east of the theater of war in Natal by the imperial light horse? Was there ever a body of men more happily imbued with the military spirit, full of martial ardor, of self-sacrificing patriotism, formed of better stuff to maintain the empire, to defend, and, if need be, to extend it? And what are we to say of our regular troops and the naval brigade? I think nothing more spirited has ever been done in its way than the manner in which that immense journey from Cape Town to Colenso was performed by the naval brigade and its guns. I wish I had in my mind, I wish I could remember, the

exact number of hours it took after the message was received at Cape Town before the "Powerful" was at sea, turned into a workshop for the time being to mount those guns, and then, when the guns arrived at Durban, to hurry them up to the front just in time to perform incalculable services to their brothers in the field. What are we to think of this magnificent cooperation of both the services of every class, of every colony, of every dependency toward one common imperial object? There have been foreign critics who have told us that with this war begins the dissolution of the empire, which they dislike so much, which they envy so much, and which they dislike, it may be, because they envy it. I take a very different view of the situation. To me it seems as if the great imperial struggle, so far from beginning the dissolution of our empire, was, on the other hand, designed, more than any other event in history I, at all events, can recall, to make us all conscious of our citizenship, and to build up those moral qualities which are, after all, the only solid and permanent basis on which any empire can be built.

GEORGE BANCROFT

ON ANDREW JACKSON

[George Bancroft, an American statesman and historian, author of the ablest history of our country as regards the colonial and revolutionary period, was born in Massachusetts in 1800. Having been graduated at Harvard in his seventeenth year, he went to Germany and entered upon a course at Göttingen, taking a doctor's degree there when he was only twenty years of age. Returning to his native land he published various writings, including a volume of his poems, and in 1834 brought out the first of the books comprising his celebrated "History of the United States." Meanwhile, his talent for statesmanship of the constructive order had begun to assert itself. President Polk gave him the portfolio of the navy and he became one of the distinguished figures of the cabinet, founding the United States Naval Academy and developing our resources at sea. In 1846 he was made our Minister to England, holding the office for three years, when he retired from the public service and returned to his literary labors in Washington. In 1867 he was sent to Berlin as Minister from our republic. He secured a treaty recognizing the rights of naturalized American citizens of German birth. When the present German empire came into being he was commissioned again to Berlin as United States Minister. He had not neglected his historical studies throughout this period. When he returned from Germany in 1874 he set to work afresh upon his history. The final volume appeared in 1885, the completed work being the fruit of half a century of research among original documents and sources of information accessible, perhaps, only to him. The style of the work is dignified and informing, and the history will probably be a permanent standard of its kind. He died in 1891. The address on General Jackson was delivered at Washington in 1845.]

WE are met to commemorate the virtues of one who shed his blood for our independence, took part in winning the territory and forming the early institutions of the West, and was imbued with all the great ideas which constitute the moral force of our country. On the spot where he gave his solemn fealty to the people—here, where

GEORGE BANCROFT

Photogravure after a painting

he pledged himself before the world to freedom, to the Constitution, and to the laws—we meet to pay our tribute to the memory of the last great name which gathers round itself all the associations that form the glory of America.

North Carolina gave a birthplace to Andrew Jackson. On its remote frontier, far up on the forest-clad banks of the Catawba, in a region where the settlers were just beginning to cluster, his eye first saw the light. There his infancy sported in the ancient forests, and his mind was nursed to freedom by their influence. He was the youngest son of an Irish emigrant, of Scottish origin, who, two years after the great war of Frederick of Prussia, fled to America for relief from indigence and oppression. His birth was in 1767, at a time when the people of our land were but a body of dependent colonists, scarcely more than two millions in number, scattered along an immense coast, with no army, or navy, or union; and exposed to the attempts of England to control America by the aid of military force. His boyhood grew up in the midst of the contest with Great Britain. The first great political truth that reached his heart was that all men are free and equal; the first great fact that beamed on his understanding was his country's independence.

The strife, as it increased, came near the shades of his own upland residence. As a boy of thirteen he witnessed the scenes of horror that accompany civil war; and when but a year older, with an elder brother, he shouldered his musket and went forth to strike a blow for his country.

Joyous era for America and for humanity! But for him, the orphan boy, the events were full of agony and grief. His father was no more. His oldest brother fell a victim to the War of the Revolution; another, his companion in arms, died of wounds received in their joint captivity; his mother went down to the grave a victim to grief and efforts to rescue her sons; and when peace came he was alone in the world, with no kindred to cherish him and little inheritance but his own untried powers.

The nation which emancipated itself from British rule organizes itself; the Confederation gives way to the Constitution; the perfecting of that Constitution—that grand event of the thousand years of modern history—is accom-

plished; America exists as a people, gains unity as a government, and assumes its place among the nations of the earth.

The next great office to be performed by America is the taking possession of the wilderness. The magnificent western valley cried out to the civilization of popular power that the season had come for its occupation by cultivated man.

Behold, then, our orphan hero, sternly earnest, consecrated to humanity from childhood by sorrow, having neither father, nor mother, nor sister, nor surviving brother, so young and yet so solitary, and therefore bound the more closely to collective man—behold him elect for his lot to go forth and assist in laying the foundations of society in the great valley of the Mississippi.

At the very time when Washington was pledging his own and future generations to the support of the popular institutions which were to be the light of the human race—at the time when the governments of the Old World were rocking to their center, and the mighty fabric that had come down from the middle ages was falling in—the adventurous Jackson, in the radiant glory and boundless hope and confident intrepidity of twenty-one, plunged into the wilderness, crossed the great mountain barrier that divides the western waters from the Atlantic, followed the paths of the early hunters and fugitives, and, not content with the nearer neighborhood to his parent state, went still further and further to the west till he found his home in the most beautiful region on the Cumberland. There, from the first, he was recognized as the great pioneer, and in his courage the coming emigrants were sure to find a shield.

The lovers of adventure began to pour themselves into the territory whose delicious climate and fertile soil invited the presence of social man. The hunter, with his rifle and his ax, attended by his wife and children; the herdsman, driving a few cattle that were to multiply as they browsed; the cultivator of the soil,—all came to the inviting region. Wherever the bending mountains opened a pass—wherever the buffaloes and beasts of the forest had made a trace, these sons of nature, children of humanity, in the highest sentiment of personal freedom, came to occupy the lovely

wilderness whose prairies blossomed everywhere profusely with wild flowers—whose woods in spring put to shame by their magnificence the cultivated gardens of man.

And now that these unlettered fugitives, educated only by the spirit of freedom, destitute of dead-letter erudition, but sharing the living ideas of the age, had made their homes in the West, what would follow? Would they degrade themselves to ignorance and infidelity? Would they make the solitudes of the desert excuses for licentiousness? Would the hatred of excessive restraint lead them to live in unorganized society, destitute of laws and fixed institutions?

At a time when European society was becoming broken in pieces, scattered, disunited, and resolved into its elements, a scene ensued in Tennessee, than which nothing more beautifully grand is recorded in the annals of the race.

These adventurers in the wilderness longed to come together in organized society. The overshadowing genius of their time inspired them with good designs and filled them with the counsels of wisdom. Dwellers in the forest, freest of the free, bound in the spirit, they came up by their representatives, on foot, on horseback, through the forest, along the streams, by the buffalo traces, by the Indian paths, by the blazed forest avenues, to meet in convention among the mountains of Knoxville and devise for themselves a constitution. Andrew Jackson was there, the greatest man of them all—modest, bold, determined, demanding nothing for himself, and shrinking from nothing that his heart approved.

The convention came together on the eleventh day of January, 1796, and finished its work on the sixth day of February. How had the wisdom of the Old World vainly tasked itself to devise constitutions that could at least be the subject of experiment! The men of Tennessee in less than twenty-five days perfected a fabric which, in its essential forms, was to last forever. They came together full of faith and reverence, of love to humanity, of confidence in truth. In the simplicity of wisdom they constructed their system, acting under higher influences than they were conscious of.

"They wrought in sad sincerity,
Themselves from God they could not free.
They builded better than they knew;
The conscious stones to beauty grew."

In the instrument which they adopted they embodied their faith in God and in the immortal nature of man. They gave the right of suffrage to every freeman; they vindicated the sanctity of reason by securing freedom of speech and of the press; they reverenced the voice of God as it speaks in the soul, by asserting the indefeasible right of man to worship the Infinite according to his conscience; they established the freedom and equality of elections; and they demanded from every future legislator a solemn oath "never to consent to any act or thing whatever that shall have even a tendency to lessen the rights of the people."

These majestic lawgivers, wiser than the Solons, and Lycurguses, and Numas of the Old World,—these prophetic founders of a state, who embodied in their constitution the sublimest truths of humanity, acted without reference to human praises. They took no pains to vaunt their deeds; and when their work was done knew not that they had finished one of the sublimest acts ever performed among men. They left no record as to whose agency was conspicuous, whose eloquence swayed, whose generous will predominated; nor should we know, but for tradition, confirmed by what followed among themselves.

The men of Tennessee were now a people, and they were to send forth a man to stand for them in the Congress of the United States—that avenue to glory—that home of eloquence—the citadel of popular power; and with one consent they united in selecting the foremost man among their lawgivers—Andrew Jackson.

The love of his constituents followed him to the American Congress; and he had served but a single term when the State of Tennessee made him one of its representatives in the American Senate, of which Jefferson was at the time the presiding officer.

Thus, when he was scarcely more than thirty he had guided the settlement of the wilderness; swayed the deliberations of a people in establishing their fundamental laws;

acted as their representative, and again as the representative of his organized commonwealth, disciplined to a knowledge of the power of the people and the power of the states; the associate of republican statesmen, the friend and companion of Jefferson.

The men who framed the Constitution of the United States, many of them, did not know the innate life and self-preserving energy of their work. They feared that freedom could not endure, and they planned a strong government for its protection. During his short career in Congress, Jackson showed his quiet, deeply seated, innate, intuitive faith in human freedom, and in the institutions which rested on that faith. He was ever, by his votes and opinions, found among those who had confidence in humanity; and in the great division of minds this child of the woodlands, this representative of forest life in the West, appeared modestly and firmly on the side of liberty. It did not occur to him to doubt the right of man to the free development of his powers; it did not occur to him to place a guardianship over the people; it did not occur to him to seek to give durability to popular institutions by conceding to government a strength independent of popular will.

From the first he was attached to the fundamental doctrines of popular power and of the policy that favors it; and though his reverence for Washington surpassed his reverence for any human being, he voted against the address from the House of Representatives to Washington on his retirement, because its language appeared to sanction the financial policy which he believed hostile to the true principles of a republic.

During his period of service in the Senate, Jackson was elected major-general by the brigadiers and field officers of the militia of Tennessee. Resigning his place in the Senate, he was made judge of the Supreme Court in law and equity; such was the confidence in his clearness of judgment, his vigor of will, and his integrity of purpose, to deal justly among the turbulent who crowded into the new settlements of Tennessee.

Thus, in the short period of nine years, Andrew Jackson was signalized by as many evidences of public esteem as could fall to the lot of man. The pioneer of the wilder-

ness, the defender of its stations, he was the lawgiver of a new people, their sole representative in Congress, the representative of the state in the Senate, the highest in military command, the highest in judicial office. He seemed to be recognized as the first in love of liberty, in the science of legislation, in sagacity, in integrity.

Delighting in private life, he would have resigned his place on the bench, but the whole country demanded his continued service. "Nature," they cried, "never designed that your powers of thought and independence of mind should be lost in retirement." But after a few years, relieving himself from the cares of the court, he gave himself to the activity and the independent life of a husbandman. He carried into retirement the fame of natural intelligence, and was cherished as "a prompt, frank, and ardent soul." His vigor of character gave him the lead among all with whom he associated, and his name was familiarly spoken round every hearthstone in Tennessee. Men loved to discuss his qualities. All discerned his power, and when the vehemence and impetuosity of his nature were observed upon, there were not wanting those who saw beneath the blazing fires of his genius the solidity of his judgment.

His hospitable roof sheltered the emigrant and the pioneer; and as they made their way to their new homes they filled the mountain sides and the valleys with his praise.

Connecting himself for a season with a man of business, Jackson soon discerned the misconduct of his associate. It marked his character that he insisted, himself, on paying every obligation that had been contracted; and rather than endure the vassalage of debt he instantly parted with the rich domain which his early enterprise had acquired—with his own mansion—with the fields which he himself had first tamed to the plowshare—with the forest whose trees were as familiar to him as his friends—and chose rather to dwell for a time in a rude log cabin in the pride of independence and integrity.

On all great occasions his influence was deferred to. When Jefferson had acquired for the country the whole of Louisiana, and there seemed some hesitancy on the part

of Spain to acknowledge our possession, the services of Jackson were solicited by the national administration, and would have been called into full exercise but for the peaceful termination of the incidents that occasioned the summons.

In the long series of aggressions on the freedom of the seas, and the rights of the American flag, Jackson, though in his inland home the roar of the breakers was never heard and the mariner never was seen, resented the injuries wantonly inflicted on our commerce and on our sailors, and adhered to the new maritime code of republicanism.

When the continuance of wrong compelled the nation to resort to arms, Jackson, led by the instinctive knowledge of his own greatness, yet with true modesty of nature, confessed his willingness to be employed on the Canada frontier, and aspired to the command to which Winchester was appointed. We may ask, What would have been the result if the conduct of the northwestern army had, at the opening of the war, been intrusted to a man who in action was ever so fortunate that he seemed to have made destiny capitulate to his vehement will?

The path of duty led him in another direction. On the declaration of war twenty-five hundred volunteers had risen at his word to follow his standard; but by countermanding orders from the seat of government the movement was without effect.

A new and greater danger hung over the West. The Indian tribes were to make one last effort to restore it to its solitude and recover it for savage life. The brave, relentless Shawnees—who from time immemorial had strolled from the waters of the Ohio to the rivers of Alabama—were animated by Tecumseh and his brother, the Prophet, speaking to them as with the voice of the Great Spirit, and urging the Creek nation to desperate massacres. Their ruthless cruelty spared neither sex nor age; the infant and its mother, the planter and his family, who had fled for refuge to the fortress, the garrison that capitulated, all were slain, and not a vestige of defense was left in the country. The cry of the West demanded Jackson for its defender; and though his arm was then fractured by a ball and hung in a sling, he placed himself at the head of the volunteers of

Tennessee and resolved to terminate forever the hereditary struggle.

Who can tell the horrors of that campaign? Who can paint rightly the obstacles which Jackson overcame—mountains, the scarcity of untenanted forests, winter, the failure of supplies from the settlements, the insubordination of troops, mutiny, menaces of desertion? Who can measure the wonderful power over men by which his personal prowess and attractive energy drew them in midwinter from their homes, across mountains and morasses, and through trackless deserts? Who can describe the personal heroism of Jackson, never sparing himself, beyond any of his men encountering toil and fatigue, sharing every labor of the camp and of the march, foremost in every danger; giving up his horse to the invalid soldier, while he himself waded through the swamps on foot? None equaled him in power of endurance, and the private soldiers, as they found him passing them on the march, exclaimed, "He is as tough as the hickory." "Yes," they cried to one another, "there goes Old Hickory!"

Then followed the memorable events of the double battles of Emuckfaw, and the glorious victory of Tohopeka, where the anger of the general against the faltering was more appalling than the war-whoop and the rifle of the savage; the fiercely contested field of Enotochopco, where the general, as he attempted to draw his sword to cut down a flying colonel who was leading a regiment from the field, broke again the arm which was but newly knit together; and, quietly replacing it in the sling, with his commanding voice arrested the flight of the troops and himself led them back to victory.

In six short months of vehement action the most terrible Indian war in our annals was brought to a close; the prophets were silenced; the consecrated region of the Creek nation reduced. Through scenes of blood the avenging hero sought only the path of peace. Thus Alabama, a part of Mississippi, a part of his own Tennessee, and the highway to the Floridas, were his gifts to the Union. These were his trophies.

Genius as extraordinary as military events can call forth was summoned into action in this rapid, efficient, and most

fortunately conducted war. The hero descended the water-courses of Alabama to the neighborhood of Pensacola, and longed to plant the eagle of his country on its battlements.

Time would fail, and words be wanting, were I to dwell on the magical influence of his appearance in New Orleans. His presence dissipated gloom and dispelled alarm; at once he changed the aspect of despair into a confidence of security and a hope of acquiring glory. Every man knows the tale of the sudden and yet deliberate daring which led him, on the night of the twenty-third of December, to precipitate his little army on his foes, in the thick darkness, before they grew familiar with their encampment, scattering dismay through veteran regiments of England, defeating them, and arresting their progress by a far inferior force.

Who shall recount the counsels of prudence, the kindling words of eloquence, that gushed from his lips to cheer his soldiers, his skirmishes and battles, till that eventful morning when the day at Bunker Hill had its fulfilment in the glorious battle of New Orleans, and American independence stood before the world in the majesty of triumphant power!

These were great victories for the nation; over himself he won a greater. Had not Jackson been renowned for the impetuosity of his passions, for his defiance of others' authority, and the unbending vigor of his self-will? Behold the savior of Louisiana, all garlanded with victory, viewing around him the city he had preserved, the maidens and children whom his heroism had protected, yet standing in the presence of a petty judge, who gratifies his wounded vanity by an abuse of his judicial power. Every breast in the crowded audience heaves with indignation. He, the passionate, the impetuous—he whose power was to be humbled, whose honor questioned, whose laurels tarnished, alone stood sublimely serene; and when the craven judge trembled, and faltered, and dared not proceed, himself, the arraigned one, bade him take courage, and stood by the law, even when the law was made the instrument of insult and wrong on himself at the moment of his most perfect claim to the highest civic honors.

His country, when it grew to hold many more millions, the generation that then was coming in, has risen up to do

homage to the magnanimity of that hour. Woman, whose feeling is always right, did honor from the first to the purity of his heroism. The people of Louisiana, to the latest age, will cherish his name as their greatest benefactor.

The culture of Jackson's mind had been much promoted by his services and associations in the war. His discipline of himself as the chief in command, his intimate relations with men like Livingston, the wonderful deeds in which he bore a part, all matured his judgment and mellowed his character.

Peace came, with its delights; once more the country rushed forward in the development of its powers; once more the arts of industry healed the wounds that war had inflicted; and from commerce, and agriculture, and manufactures, wealth gushed abundantly under the free activity of unrestrained enterprise. And Jackson returned to his own fields and his own pursuits, to cherish his plantation, to care for his servants, to enjoy the affection of the most kind and devoted wife, whom he respected with the gentlest deference, and loved with a spotless purity.

There he stood, like one of the mightiest forest trees of his own West, vigorous and colossal, sending its summit to the skies, and growing on its native soil in wild and inimitable magnificence, careless of beholders. From every part of the country he received appeals to his political ambition, and the severe modesty of his well-balanced mind turned them all aside. He was happy in his farm, happy in seclusion, happy in his family, happy within himself.

But the passions of the southern Indians were not allayed by the peace with Great Britain; and foreign emissaries were still among them, to inflame and direct their malignity. Jackson was called forth by his country to restrain the cruelty of the treacherous and unsparing Seminoles. It was in the train of the events of this war that he placed the American eagle on St. Mark's and above the ancient towers of St. Augustine. His deeds in that war of themselves form a monument to human power, to the celerity of his genius, to the creative fertility of his resources, to his intuitive sagacity. As Spain, in his judgment, had committed aggressions, he would have emancipated her islands; of the Havana, he caused the reconnaissance to be

made; and, with an army of five thousand men, he stood ready to guarantee her redemption from colonial thraldom.

But when peace was restored, and his office was accomplished, his physical strength sunk under the pestilential influence of the climate, and, fast yielding to disease, he was borne in a litter across the swamps of Florida toward his home. It was Jackson's character that he never solicited aid from any one; but he never forgot those who rendered him service in the hour of need. At a time when all around him believed him near his end, his wife hastened to his side; and, by her tenderness and nursing care, her patient assiduity and the soothing influence of devoted love, withheld him from the grave.

He would have remained quietly at his home, but that he was privately informed his conduct was to be attainted by some intended congressional proceedings; he came, therefore, into the presence of the people's representatives at Washington, only to vindicate his name; and, when that was achieved, he once more returned to his seclusion among the groves of the Hermitage.

It was not his own ambition which brought him again to the public view. The affection of Tennessee compelled him to resume his seat on the floor of the American Senate, and, after a long series of the intensest political strife, Andrew Jackson was elected President of the United States.

Far from advancing his own pretensions, he always kept them back, and had for years repressed the solicitations of his friends to become a candidate. He felt sensibly that he was devoid of scientific culture, and little familiar with letters; and he never obtruded his opinions, or preferred claims to place. But whenever his advice was demanded, he was always ready to pronounce it; and whenever his country invoked his services, he did not shrink even from the station which had been filled by the most cultivated men our nation had produced.

Behold, then, the unlettered man of the West, the nursling of the wilds, the farmer of the Hermitage, little versed in books, unconnected by science with the traditions of the past, raised by the will of the people to the highest pinnacle of honor, to the central post in the civilization of republican freedom, to the office where all the powers of the earth

would watch his actions—where his words would be repeated through the world, and his spirit be the moving star to guide the nations. What policy will he pursue? What wisdom will he bring with him from the forest? What rules of duty will he evolve from the oracles of his own mind?

The man of the West came as the inspired prophet of the West; he came as one free from the bonds of hereditary or established custom; he came with no superior but conscience, no oracle but his native judgment; and, true to his origin and his education, true to the conditions and circumstances of his advancement, he valued right more than usage; he reverted from the pressure of established interests to the energy of first principles.

We tread on ashes where the fire is not yet extinguished; yet not to dwell on his career as President were to leave out of view the grandest illustrations of his magnanimity.

The legislation of the United States had followed the precedents of the legislation of European monarchies; it was the office of Jackson to lift the country out of the European forms of legislation, and to open to it a career resting on American sentiment and American freedom. He would have freedom everywhere—freedom under the restraints of right; freedom of industry, of commerce, of mind, of universal action; freedom, unshackled by restrictive privileges, unrestrained by the thraldom of monopolies.

The unity of his mind and his consistency were without a parallel. Guided by natural dialectics, he developed the political doctrines that suited every emergency, with a precision and a harmony that no theorist could hope to equal. On every subject in politics he was thoroughly and profoundly and immovably radical; and would sit for hours, and in a continued flow of remark make the application of his principles to every question that could arise in legislation, or in the interpretation of the Constitution.

His expression of himself was so clear that his influence pervaded not our land only, but all America and all mankind. They say that in the physical world the magnetic fluid is so diffused that its vibrations are discernible simultaneously in every part of the globe. So it is with the element of freedom. And as Jackson developed its doctrines

from their source in the mind of humanity, the popular sympathy was moved and agitated throughout the world, till his name grew everywhere to be the symbol of popular power.

Himself the witness of the ruthlessness of savage life, he planned the removal of the Indian tribes beyond the limits of the organized states; and it is the result of his determined policy that the region east of the Mississippi has been transferred to the exclusive possession of cultivated man.

A pupil of the wilderness, his heart was with the pioneers of American life toward the setting sun. He longed to secure to the emigrant, not preemption rights only, but more than preemption rights. He longed to invite labor to take possession of the unoccupied fields without money and without price; with no obligation except the perpetual devotion of itself by allegiance to its country. Under the beneficent influence of his opinions, the sons of misfortune, the children of adventure, find their way to the uncultivated West. There in some wilderness glade, or in the thick forest of the fertile plain, or where the prairies most sparkle with flowers, they, like the wild bee which sets them the example of industry, may choose their home, mark the extent of their possessions by driving stakes or blazing trees, shelter their log cabin with boughs and turf, and teach the virgin soil to yield itself to the plowshare. Theirs shall be the soil; theirs the beautiful farms which they teach to be productive. Come, children of sorrow! you on whom the Old World frowns; crowd fearlessly to the forests; plant your homes in confidence, for the country watches over you; your children grow around you as hostages, and the wilderness, at your bidding, surrenders its grandeur of useless luxuriance to the beauty and loveliness of culture. Yet beautiful and lovely as is this scene, it still by far falls short of the ideal which lived in the affections of Jackson.

It would be a sin against the occasion were I to omit to commemorate the deep devotedness of Jackson to the cause and to the rights of the laboring classes. It was for their welfare that he defied all the storms of political hostility. He desired to insure to them the fruits of their own industry; and he unceasingly opposed every system which tended

to lessen their reward, or which exposed them to be defrauded of their dues. They may bend over his grave with affectionate sorrow; for never, in the tide of time, did a statesman exist more heartily resolved to protect them in their rights, and to advance their happiness. For their benefit, he opposed partial legislation; for their benefit, he resisted all artificial methods of controlling labor and subjecting it to capital. It was for their benefit that he loved freedom in all its forms—freedom of the individual in personal independence, freedom of the states as separate sovereignties. He never would listen to counsels which tended to the concentration of power, the subjecting general labor to a central will. The true American system presupposes the diffusion of freedom—organized life in all the parts of the American body politic, as there is organized life in every part of the human system. His vindication of the just principles of the Constitution derived its sublimity from his deep conviction that this strict construction is required by the lasting welfare of the great laboring classes of the United States.

To this end, Jackson revived the tribunitial power of the veto, and exerted it against the decisive action of both branches of Congress, against the votes, the wishes, the entreaties of personal and political friends. "Show me," was his reply to them, "show me an express clause in the Constitution authorizing Congress to take the business of state legislatures out of their hands." "You will ruin us all," cried a firm partisan friend; "you will ruin your party and your own prospects." "Providence," answered Jackson, "will take care of me;" and he persevered.

In proceeding to discharge the debt of the United States —a measure thoroughly American—Jackson followed the example of his predecessors; but he followed it with the full consciousness that he was rescuing the country from the artificial system of finance which had prevailed throughout the world; and with him it formed a part of a system by which American legislation was to separate itself more and more effectually from European precedents, and develop itself more and more according to the vital principles of our political existence.

The discharge of the debt brought with it a great reduc-

tion of the public burdens, and brought, of necessity, into view the question, how far America should follow, of choice, the old restrictive policy of high duties, under which Europe had oppressed America; or how far she should rely on her own freedom, enterprise, and power, defying competition, seeking the markets, and receiving the products of the world.

The mind of Jackson on this subject reasoned clearly, and without passion. In the abuses of the system of revenue by excessive imposts he saw evils which the public mind would remedy; and, inclining with the whole might of his energetic nature to the side of revenue duties, he made his earnest but tranquil appeal to the judgment of the people.

The portions of country that suffered most severely from a course of legislation which, in its extreme character as it then existed, is now universally acknowledged to have been unequal and unjust, were less tranquil; and rallying on those doctrines of freedom which make our government a limited one, they saw in the oppressive acts an assumption of power which of itself was nugatory, because it was exercised, as they held, without authority from the people.

The contest that ensued was the most momentous in our annals. The greatest minds of America engaged in the discussion. Eloquence never achieved sublimer triumphs in the American Senate than on those occasions. The country became deeply divided; and the antagonist elements were arrayed against each other under forms of clashing authority menacing civil war; the freedom of the several states was invoked against the power of the United States; and under the organization of a state in convention, the reserved rights of the people were summoned to display their energy, and balance the authority and neutralize the legislation of the central government. The states were agitated with prolonged excitement; the friends of liberty throughout the world looked on with divided sympathies, praying that the American Union might be perpetual, and also that the commerce of the world might be free.

Fortunately for the country, and fortunately for mankind, Andrew Jackson was at the helm of state, the representative of the principles that were to allay the storm, and

to restore the hopes of peace and freedom. By nature, by impulse, by education, by conviction, a friend to personal freedom—by education, political sympathies, and the fixed habit of his mind, a friend to the rights of the states—unwilling that the liberty of the states should be trampled under foot—unwilling that the government should lose its vigor or be impaired, he rallied for the Constitution; and in its name he published to the world, "The Union: it must be preserved." The words were a spell to hush evil passion and to remove oppression. Under his effective guidance the favored interests which had struggled to perpetuate unjust legislation yielded to the voice of moderation and reform, and every mind that had for a moment contemplated a rupture of the states discarded it forever. The whole influence of the past was invoked in favor of the federal system; from the council chambers of the fathers who molded our institutions, from the hall where American independence was declared, the clear, loud cry was uttered —"the Union: it must be preserved." From every battle-field of the Revolution—from Lexington and Bunker Hill, from Saratoga and Yorktown, from the fields of Eutaw and King's Mountain, from the cane-brakes that sheltered the men of Marion—the repeated, long-prolonged echoes came up—"the Union: it must be preserved." From every valley in our land, from every cabin on the pleasant mountain-sides, from the ships at our wharves, from the tents of the hunter in our westernmost prairies, from the living minds of the living millions of American freemen, from the thickly coming glories of futurity, the shout went up, like the sound of many waters, "the Union: it must be preserved." The friends of the protective system, and they who had denounced the protective system—the statesmen of the North, that had wounded the Constitution in their love of increased power at the center—the statesmen of the South, whose ingenious acuteness had carried to its extreme the theory of state rights—all conspired together; all breathed prayers for the perpetuity of the Union. Under the prudent firmness of Jackson, by the mixture of justice and general regard for all interests, the greatest danger to our country was turned aside, and mankind was encouraged to believe that our Union, like our freedom, is imperishable.

The moral of the great events of those days is this: That the people can discern right, and will make their way to a knowledge of right; that the whole human mind, and therefore with it the mind of the nation, has a continuous, ever-improving existence; that the appeal from the unjust legislation of to-day must be made quietly, earnestly, perseveringly, to the more enlightened collective reason of to-morrow; that submission is due to the popular will, in the confidence that the people, when in error, will amend their doings; that in a popular government injustice is neither to be established by force nor to be resisted by force; in a word, that the Union, which was constituted by consent, must be preserved by love.

It rarely falls to the happy lot of a statesman to receive such unanimous applause from the heart of a nation. Duty to the dead demands that on this occasion the course of measures should not pass unnoticed in the progress of which his vigor of character most clearly appeared and his conflict with opposing parties was most violent and protracted.

From his home in Tennessee Jackson came to the presidency, resolved to lift American legislation out of the forms of English legislation, and to place our laws on the currency in harmony with the principles of our republic. He came to the Presidency of the United States determined to deliver the government from the Bank of the United States, and to restore the regulation of exchanges to the rightful depository of that power—the commerce of the country. He had designed to declare his views on this subject in his inaugural address, but was persuaded to relinquish that purpose, on the ground that it belonged rather to a legislative message. When the period for addressing Congress drew near, it was still urged that to attack the bank would forfeit his popularity and secure his future defeat. "It is not," he answered, "it is not for myself that I care." It was urged that haste was unnecessary, as the bank had still six unexpended years of chartered existence. "I may die," he replied, "before another Congress comes together, and I could not rest quietly in my grave if I failed to do what I hold so essential to the liberty of my country." And his first annual message announced to the people that the bank was neither constitutional nor expedient. In this he was in

advance of the friends about him, in advance of Congress, and in advance of his party. This is no time for the analysis of measures or the discussion of questions of political economy; on the present occasion we have to contemplate the character of the man.

Never, from the first moment of his administration to the last, was there a calm in the strife of parties on the subject of the currency; and never during the whole period did he recede or falter. Remaining always in advance of his party, always having near him friends who cowered before the hardihood of his courage, he himself was unmoved from the first suggestion of the unconstitutionality of the bank to the moment when first of all, reasoning from the certain tendency of its policy, he, with singular sagacity, predicted to unbelieving friends the coming insolvency of the institution.

The storm throughout the country rose with unexampled vehemence; his opponents were not satisfied with addressing the public, or Congress, or his cabinet; they threw their whole force personally on him. From all parts men pressed around him, urging him, entreating him to bend. Congress was flexible; many of his personal friends faltered; the impetuous swelling wave rolled on, without one sufficient obstacle, till it reached his presence; but as it dashed in its highest fury at his feet it broke before his firmness. The commanding majesty of his will appalled his opponents and revived his friends. He himself had a proud consciousness that his will was indomitable. Standing over the ripraps, and looking out upon the ocean, "Providence," said he to a friend, "Providence may change my determination; but man no more can do it than he can remove these ripraps, which have resisted the rolling of the ocean from the beginning of time." And though a panic was spreading through the land, and the whole credit system as it then existed was crumbling to pieces and crashing around him, he stood erect, like a massive column, which the heaps of falling ruins could not break, nor bend, nor sway from its fixed foundation.

In the relations of this country to the world Jackson demanded for America equality. The time was come for her to take her place over against the most ancient and

most powerful states of the Old World, and to gain the recognition of her pretensions. He revived the unadjusted claims for injuries to our commerce, committed in the wantonness of European hostilities; and he taught the American merchant and the American sailor to repose confidingly under the sanctity of the American flag. Nor would he consent that the payment of indemnities which were due should be withheld or delayed. Even against France the veteran of the West enforced the just demand of America with an heroic vigor which produced an abiding impression on the world. He did this in the love of peace. "You have set your name to the most important document of your public life," said one of his cabinet to him as he signed the annual message that treated of the unpaid indemnity. "This paper may produce a war." "There will be no war," answered Jackson decisively; and rising on his feet, as was his custom when he spoke warmly, he expressed with solemnity his hatred of war, bearing witness to its horrors, and protesting against its crimes. He loved peace; and to secure permanent tranquillity he made the rule for his successors, as well as for himself, in the intercourse of America with foreign powers, "to demand nothing but what is right, and to submit to nothing that is wrong."

People of the District of Columbia, I should fail of a duty on this occasion if I did not give utterance to your sentiment of gratitude which followed General Jackson into retirement. This beautiful city, surrounded by heights the most attractive, watered by a river so magnificent, the home of the gentle and the cultivated, not less than the seat of political power—this city, whose site Washington had selected, was dear to his affections; and if he won your grateful attachment by adorning it with monuments of useful architecture, by establishing its credit, and relieving it of its burdens, he regretted only that he had not the opportunity to have connected himself still more intimately with your prosperity. When he took leave of the district, the population of this city, and the masses from its vicinity, followed his carriage in crowds. All in silence stood near him, to wish him adieu; and as the cars started, and lifting his hat in token of farewell, he displayed his gray hairs, you stood around with heads uncovered, too full of emotion to

speak, in solemn silence gazing on him as he went on his way to be seen of you no more.

Behold the warrior and statesman, his work well done, retired to the Hermitage, to hold converse with his forests, to cultivate his farm, to gather around him hospitably his friends! Who was like him? He was the lone-star of the American people. His fervid thoughts, frankly uttered, still spread the flame of patriotism through the American breast; his counsels were still listened to with reverence; and, almost alone among statesmen, he in his retirement was in harmony with every onward movement of his time. His prevailing influence assisted to sway a neighboring nation to desire to share our institutions; his ear heard the footsteps of the coming millions that are to gladden our western shores; and his eye discerned in the dim distance the whitening sails that are to enliven the Pacific with the social sounds of our commerce.

Age had whitened his locks and dimmed his eye and spread round him the infirmities and venerable emblems of many years of toilsome service; but his heart beat warmly as in his youth, and his courage was firm as it had ever been in the day of battle. His affections were still for his friends and his country, his thoughts were already in a better world. He who in active life had always had unity of perception and will, in action had never faltered from doubt, and in council had always reverted to first principles and general laws, now gave himself to communing with the Infinite. He was a believer; from feeling, from experience, from conviction. Not a shadow of skepticism ever dimmed the luster of his mind. Proud philosopher! will you smile to know that Andrew Jackson perused reverently his Psalter and Prayer-book and Bible? Know that he had faith in the eternity of truth, in the imperishable power of freedom, in the destinies of humanity, in the virtues and capacity of the people, in his country's institutions, in the being and over-ruling providence of a merciful and ever-living God.

The last moment of his life on earth is at hand. It is the Sabbath of the Lord; the brightness and beauty of summer clothe the fields around him; Nature is in her glory; but the sublimest spectacle on that day was the victory of his unblenching spirit over death itself.

When he first felt the hand of death upon him, "May my enemies," he cried, "find peace; may the liberties of my country endure forever."

When his exhausted system, under the excess of pain, sunk, for a moment, from debility, "Do not weep," said he to his adopted daughter; "my sufferings are less than those of Christ upon the cross"; for he, too, as a disciple of the cross, could have devoted himself, in sorrow, for mankind. Feeling his end near, he would see all his family once more; and he spoke to them, one by one, in words of tenderness and affection. His two little grandchildren were absent at Sunday-school. He asked for them; and as they came, he prayed for them, and kissed them, and blessed them. His servants were then summoned; they gathered, some in his room, and some on the outside of the house, clinging to the windows, that they might gaze and hear. And that dying man, thus surrounded, in a gush of fervid eloquence, spoke with inspiration of God, of the Redeemer, of salvation through the atonement, of immortality, of heaven. For he ever thought that pure and undefiled religion was the foundation of private happiness, and the bulwark of republican institutions. "Dear children"—such were his final words—"dear children, servants, and friends, I trust to meet you all in heaven, both white and black—all, both white and black." And having borne his testimony to immortality, he bowed his mighty head, and, without a groan, the spirit of the greatest man of his age escaped to the bosom of his God.

In life, his career had been like the blaze of the sun in the fierceness of its noonday glory; his death was lovely as the summer's evening, when the sun goes down in tranquil beauty without a cloud. To the majestic energy of an indomitable will he joined a heart capable of the purest and most devoted love, rich in the tenderest affections. On the bloody battle-field of Topoheca, he saved an infant that clung to the breast of its dying mother; in the stormiest season of his presidency he paused at the imminent moment of decision to counsel a poor suppliant that had come up to him for relief. Of the strifes in which he was engaged in his earlier life, not one sprung from himself, but in every case he became involved by standing forth as the champion of

the weak, the poor, and the defenseless, to shelter the gentle against oppression, to protect the emigrant against the avarice of the speculator. His generous soul revolted at the barbarous practise of duels, and by no man in the land have so many been prevented.

The sorrows of those that were near to him went deeply into his soul; and at the anguish of the wife whom he loved, the orphans whom he adopted, he would melt into tears, and weep and sob like a child. No man in private life so possessed the hearts of all around him; no public man of this century ever returned to private life with such an abiding mastery over the affections of the people. No man with truer instinct received American ideas; no man expressed them so completely, or so boldly, or so sincerely. He was as sincere a man as ever lived. He was wholly, always, and altogether sincere and true.

Up to the last he dared do anything that it was right to do. He united personal courage and moral courage beyond any man of whom history keeps the record. Before the nation, before the world, before coming ages, he stands forth the representative, for his generation, of the American mind. And the secret of his greatness is this: By intuitive conception he shared and possessed all the creative ideas of his country and his time; he expressed them with dauntless intrepidity; he enforced them with an immovable will; he executed them with an electric power that attracted and swayed the American people. The nation, in his time, had not one great thought of which he was not the boldest and clearest expositor.

Not danger, not an army in battle array, not wounds, not widespread clamor, not age, not the anguish of disease, could impair in the least degree the vigor of his steadfast mind. The heroes of antiquity would have contemplated with awe the unmatched hardihood of his character; and Napoleon, had he possessed his disinterested will, could never have been vanquished. Jackson never was vanquished. He was always fortunate. He conquered the wilderness; he conquered the savage; he conquered the bravest veterans trained in the battle-fields of Europe; he conquered everywhere in statesmanship; and, when death came to get the mastery over him, he turned the last enemy

aside as tranquilly as he had done the feeblest of his adversaries, and passed from earth in the triumphant consciousness of immortality.

His body has its fit resting-place in the great central valley of the Mississippi; his spirit rests upon our whole territory; it hovers over the vales of Oregon, and guards, in advance, the frontier of the Del Norte. The fires of party strife are quenched at his grave. His faults and frailties have perished. Whatever of good he has done lives, and will live forever.

THOMAS FRANCIS BAYARD

ON THE UNITED STATES ARMY

[Thomas Francis Bayard, an American statesman whose eloquence was of a distinguished character, was born in Delaware in 1828, his father, his grandfather, and his great-grandfather having represented that state in the United States Senate. He received an academic education, studied law, and entered public life as a Democrat. He succeeded his father in the United States Senate, where he served three terms. President Cleveland made him Secretary of State in his first and Ambassador to Great Britain in his second administration. His utterances in England were pro-British, and brought down upon him some criticism in the United States House of Representatives. He died in 1898. The speech that follows is an eloquent tribute to the United States army, and was delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa Society, at Harvard University, in 1877.]

THE army of the United States, like the militia of the several states, is the creation of their respective legislation; like the "princes and lords" of Goldsmith's verse—

"A breath can make them, as a breath hath made."

"He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of the legislature," was one of the facts justifying revolution, "submitted to a candid world," by the founders of this government. So long as human nature remains unchanged, the final argument of force cannot be disregarded; but, outside and beyond the will of the people expressed by law, an American army cannot exist; it is but their instrument for their own service. It is wholly dependent upon them; and they are never dependent upon it, and never will be while civil liberty exists in substance among us.

When called into existence, the army represents the military spirit of the whole nation, and is supported by the enthusiasm and pride of all. It is composed of American

valor, skill, and energy, and is dedicated to the glory of our common country, whose history contains no brighter pages than those which record the naval and military achievements of her sons; but neither army nor navy stands now, nor ever did, nor ever will, toward the American people in the relation of policemen to a turbulent crowd. And those who would wish to see it placed in such an attitude, and employed in such work, are short-sighted indeed, and little regard the true dignity of the American soldier, or the real security of the American citizen.

The army of the United States is born of the martial spirit of a brave people, and is the product of national courage. This hall is hallowed as a memorial of the valor and devotion of those gallant youths who made themselves part of the army at a time when they felt their country needed their service, and who freely offered up their lives upon the altar of patriotism.

"Oh, those who live are heroes now, and martyrs those who sleep."

Their surviving companions have returned to the paths of civil life, and the community is gladdened by their presence and strengthened by their example. If, to-morrow, the individuals who compose the army of the United States should return to the occupations of civil life, they would be quietly engulfed in the great wave of humanity which rolls around them, and the true forces of the government would move on in their proper orbits as quietly and securely as before the event.

Louis XIV., of France, "le grand Monarque,"—of whom it was truly said, "His highest praise was that he supported the stage trick of royalty with effect,"—caused his cannon to be cast with the words, "Ultima ratio regum"; and his apothegm has so far advanced that in our day cannon seem, not the last, but the first and only argument of royal government in Europe.

In the maze of strife, armed diplomacy, and exhausting warfare, in which all Europe now seems about to be involved, how just the picture drawn by Montesquieu nearly a century and a half ago!

"A new distemper has spread itself in Europe, infecting our princes, and inducing them to keep up an exorbitant number of troops.

It has its redoublings, and of necessity becomes contagious; for as soon as one prince augments his forces the rest, of course, do the same, so that nothing is gained thereby but public ruin. Each monarch keeps as many armies on foot as if his people were in danger of being exterminated, and they give the name of peace to this effort against all."

But a few weeks ago at Berlin, during a debate in the imperial parliament in relation to an increased grant of new captaincies of their army, a remarkable speech was made by General von Moltke, the venerable master of the science of warfare. The telegram says:—

"He insisted on the necessity of the grant. He said he wished for long peace, but the times did not permit such hope. On the contrary, the time was not far distant when every government would be compelled to strain all its strength for securing its existence. The reason for this was the regrettable distrust of governments toward each other. France had made great strides in her defenses. Uncommonly large masses of troops were at present between Paris and the German frontier. Everything France did for her army received the undivided approval of her people. She was decidedly in advance of Germany in having her cadres for war ready in times of peace. Germany could not avoid a measure destined to compensate for it."

Will it not be well for Americans to comprehend fully the importance of the confession contained in this speech?

To-day the consolidated Empire of Germany is confessedly the best organized and equipped military power on the globe.

To reach this end every nerve has been strained, every resource of that people freely applied. The idea of military excellence, like the rod of Aaron, has swallowed up all others; all others have bent to its service, until upon the shoulder of every man within her borders capable of bearing arms, the hand of the drill-sergeant has been laid, and from center to circumference of the empire centralized military power reigns supreme.

Whatever of unqualified success a victory of arms can yield, surely it was achieved by Germany in her last memorable campaign against France. And history nowhere else exhibits in such completeness and precision the mathematical demonstration of successful scientific warfare.

With a rapidity and fulness scarcely credible, the student of history saw the "whirligig of time bring in his revenges," whilst the disciples of military art witnessed demonstrations of the problems of war executed upon a scale and with a steady and intelligible certainty that approached the marvelous.

Never was a military campaign more completely and at all points successful—even to the conquest and dismemberment of the hostile territory as a safeguard for the future, and the exaction of enormous tribute by way of pecuniary reimbursement from the vanquished. Let us note well the fruit of it all, and learn, so far as we may by the costly experience of others, what are the consequences of such a system and policy. Does it secure peace, prosperity, and tranquil happiness? Let the victor answer.

It is Von Moltke, one of the chief architects of the system, himself who confesses—even whilst the garlands of his great triumph are yet unfaded on his brow—that he longs for peace, but the times do not permit such hope. That every government is soon to be compelled to strain all its strength for securing its existence.

To the worshipers of military power and the believers in armed force as the chief instrumentality of human government I commend Von Moltke's speech.

If perfected military rule brings a people to such a pass, may Heaven preserve our country from it!

Well may we exclaim with the sightless apostle of English liberty—

"What can war, but endless war still breed."

Even victory must have a future, and the only victories which can have permanence, and the fruits of which grow more secure with time, are those of justice and reason; those of mere force are almost certain to contain self-generated seeds for their own subsequent reversal.

The safety and strength of our American government consists in the self-reliant and self-controlling spirit of its people.

It was their courage, their intelligence, their virtues, that enabled our forefathers to build it up; and the same

qualities and our sense of its value will inspire their descendants with love and courage to defend it.

"Full flashing on our dormant souls the firm conviction comes
That what our fathers did for theirs—we would for our homes."

In 1789, no sooner was the original Constitution of our government adopted than the several states and their people hastened unanimously to declare in a second article of amendment that—

"A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

And by article third—

"No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner; nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

The right of the people to bear arms was thus sedulously guarded, and the necessary security of a free state was declared to be a "well-regulated militia." By the first article of the original Constitution, power was given to Congress to raise and support armies, but coupled with the express condition that no appropriation of money to that purpose should be made for a longer period than two years. When delegating power to Congress to call forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, and suppress insurrection and invasion, the power was expressly reserved to the states, respectively, to appoint their own officers, and to train the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

Thus it will be seen that in the martial spirit of a free people, and in their right to bear arms, the founders of our government reposed their trust, and experience has proved how wisely.

The army of the United States is our honorable instrument of self-defense, and its organization, its numbers, its employment, are to be regulated wholly by law. The military is at all times to be subordinate to the civil authority, and dependent upon law for its powers, and the prescription of its duties.

The existence or non-existence of an army makes no change in the character or methods of our government. It would be difficult to imagine a more unwarranted, and, to our American ear, more offensive statement than that "without the army the American people would be a mob."

The army and navy of the United States will be maintained in such strength as convenience, or the necessity of the government, shall dictate; and they will be held in the respect and honor due to valiant and faithful public servants; but there must be no confusion in the public mind as to the nature and proper theater of their duties, and their true relation to their fellow citizens.

If erroneous ideas on this subject are beginning to take shape and find expression among us, let them be quietly but effectually discouraged.

Military force is always to be regarded with jealousy by a people who would be free.

It is only by military force that usurped power can have its pretensions enforced.

All history tells us that those who aspire to extraordinary power and dominion seldom trouble themselves about anything other than armies to enforce their pretensions, always decided by the possession of the longest sword.

And here, almost in the shadow of Bunker Hill, what words so befitting this grave topic, and the words of what man so proper to be recalled and heeded, as those of the patriot Webster, uttered four-and-thirty years ago, upon the completion of the monument there erected to the valor of the citizen soldiers of America?

"Quite too frequent resort is made to military force; and quite too much of the substance of the people is consumed in maintaining armies, not for defense against foreign aggression, but for enforcing obedience to domestic authority. Standing armies are the oppressive instruments for governing the people in the ranks of hereditary and arbitrary monarchs.

"A military republic, a government founded on mock elections, and supported only by the sword, is a movement, indeed, but a retrograde and disastrous movement, from the regular and old-fashioned monarchical systems.

"If men would enjoy the blessings of the republican government, they must govern themselves by reason, by mutual counsel and consul-

tation, by a sense and feeling of general interest, and by an acquiescence of the minority in the will of the majority properly expressed; and above all the military must be kept, according to our bill of rights, in strict subordination to the civil authority.

"Wherever this lesson is not both learned and practised, there can be no political freedom. Absurd and preposterous is it, a scoff and satire on free forms of constitutional liberty, for frames of government to be prescribed by military leaders, and the right of suffrage to be exercised at the point of the sword."

The grandeur and glory of our republic must have its base in the interests and affections of our whole people; they must not be oppressed by its weight, but must see in it the work of their own hands, which they can recognize and uphold with an honest pride, and which every emotion that influences men will induce them to maintain and defend.

They must feel in their hearts "the ever-growing and eternal debt which is due to generous government from protected freedom."

Silently and almost imperceptibly the generations succeed each other, and at the close of every third lustrum it is startling to mark what a new body of men have come into the rank of leadership in our public affairs.

How few of those who to-day guide and influence public measures did so fifteen years ago.

While it may not be in the power of leading men to control the decision of issues, it is in a great degree within their ability to create issues, by pressing forward subjects for public consideration; and herein lies much of the power of the demagogue, that pest of popular government, who, seeking only his own advancement, adroitly presents topics to the public calculated only to arouse their passions and prejudices, to the neglect of matters really vital.

Despite the almost perfect religious liberty in this country, the passions of sectarianism and the prejudices inseparable from such a subject are always to be discovered floating on the surface of society, ready to be seized upon by the shallow and unscrupulous.

The embers of such differences among mankind are never cold, and the breath of the demagogue can always fan them into flame, until the placid warmth of religion,

instead of gently thawing the ice around human hearts, and imparting a glow of comfort to the homes of a happy community, becomes a raging conflagration in which the peace and good-will of society are consumed.

In a country so vast in its area, and differing so widely in all the aspects of life and occupation of its inhabitants, antagonism of interest, rivalry in business, and misunderstandings are frequently and inevitably to be expected; and the constant exercise of conciliation and harmony is called for to accommodate differences and soothe exasperation.

It is in the power of unscrupulous self-seekers to raise such issues as shall involve, not the real interest and welfare of their countrymen, but their passions only, which are easily kindled, and can leave nothing but the ashes of disappointment and bitterness as the residuum.

The war between the good and evil influences in human society will never cease, and the champions of the former can never afford to lean idly on their swords, or slumber in their tents.

All around us we see successful men, vigorous and able, but unscrupulous and base, who have engraved success alone upon their banners, and as a consequence do not hesitate to trail them in the dust of low action, and stain them with disrepute, in pursuit of their object.

They keep within the pale of the written law, having its words on their lips, but none of its spirit in their hearts. Audacity and a self-trumpeting assurance are their characteristics. They reach a bad eminence, and contrive to maintain it, by all manner of self-advertisement; utterly immodest and indelicate, but successful in keeping themselves in the public eye. To them politics is a mere game, in which stratagem and finesse are the means, and self-interest and personal advancement the end. Great aid is given to such characters by the public press, whose columns too often laud their tricky, shifty action, or at least give it the publicity it desires, without accompanying it with the condemnation it deserves.

How shall such influences be overcome? How shall we purge places of public station of men whose open boast is that they may be proven to be knaves, but cannot be called "fools"?

Nothing can effect this but the unwritten law, which shall create a tone on national honesty, truthfulness, and honor, to which the people will respond, and which will compel at least an outward imitation of the virtues upon which it is founded.

The armor of the Roman soldier covered only the front of his body. The cuirass shielded his breast, but his back was left unprotected. Each man felt himself to be the representative of the valor and good fame of his legion and his country.

The unwritten law of honor forbade him to turn his back upon danger, and thus became his impenetrable shield.

Such is the spirit and such are the laws that constitute the true safeguards of a nation against dangers from within and without.

LORD BEACONSFIELD

ON CONSERVATISM

[Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, an English statesman, twice premier of Great Britain, was born in London in 1804, being the son of the author of "The Curiosities of Literature." He was privately educated and trained as a solicitor, but turned to literature and produced at twenty-two his novel "Vivian Grey." His ambitions were mainly political, however, but he repeatedly failed to secure a seat in Parliament until he was thirty-two. His first speech called out the laughter of the House and he had to sit down, uttering his famous remark: "The time will come when you will hear me." He at once began a careful study of the style and methods of successful orators, making few speeches, but listening attentively. It was several years before he became a really important figure in the House, but he finally, when leader of the protectionists in the Commons, was appointed chancellor of the exchequer. The summit of his ambition was attained in 1868 when he succeeded Lord Derby as premier, but he had to resign the same year, returning to power in 1874. Two years later he entered the House of Lords as Earl of Beaconsfield, but in 1880 he lost the elections and was forced from office. His administrations promoted suffrage extension and vigorous foreign policies. Among his literary works may be mentioned "Henrietta Temple," "The Young Duke," and "Lothair," the latter being very successful. He died in 1881. His speech on "Conservatism" was made at Manchester in 1872.]

MR. CHAIRMAN and gentlemen: I believe I may describe the position of this country as one of very great prosperity. There is no doubt that during the last three years prosperity has been generally acknowledged. There are some who suppose that it may have received a check at the time when I paid my visit to Glasgow. If it has received a check it will increase, I hope, our circumspection, but I must express my own opinion that no substantial diminution in the sources of the prosperity so apparent during the last three years has occurred. I think

we may fairly say the state of this country is one of great prosperity, and although I believe and know that it is a prosperity for which we are not indebted either to Whigs or Tories, although I know that it has been occasioned in a considerable degree, under Providence, by fortuitous though felicitous circumstances, I am perfectly ready, speaking to-day, as I hope to speak, in the fairest terms on public affairs, which I believe to be quite consistent with the position of the leader of a party—I am ready to give to her majesty's government credit for the prosperity we feel and acknowledge. With regard to her majesty's ministers themselves, I will be equally candid, equally fair—I will take them at their own estimate. They have lost few opportunities of informing the country that they are men distinguished for commanding talent, admirable eloquence, and transcendent administrative abilities. I dispute none of these propositions any more than I do the prosperity of the country. They also tell us that the country being so prosperous, and they having all these personal advantages, they have taken the opportunity during the last few years of passing measures of immense magnitude, only equaled by the benefit they have conferred upon the people. Now, gentlemen, I will not question their own estimate of their ability, or even for a moment their own description of their achievements; but I ask this question: What is the reason, when the country is so prosperous, when its affairs are administered by so gifted a government, and when they have succeeded during five years in passing measures of such a vast character and beneficence—what is the reason that her majesty's ministers are going about regretting that they are so unpopular? Now, gentlemen, I beg you to observe that I did not say her majesty's ministers are unpopular. I stated their own case and their own position. I say that under the circumstances I have put fairly before you, it is a remarkable circumstance, and the question must be inquired into—why persons in the position of her majesty's government should on every occasion deplore the unpopularity they have incurred. Now, my opinion, gentlemen, is that that is not a question of mere curiosity—it is one that, as I think I shall show you, concerns the honor and the interests of the country. If the country is so prosper-

ous—if her majesty's ministers are so gifted—if they have had such an ample opportunity of showing the talents which they possess—if they have done all this good—if they have availed themselves of this single opportunity to effect such great results, then the only inference we can draw from the unpopularity which they themselves deplore is that the people of this country is a fickle and ungrateful people. Therefore, it is not a question of mere curiosity. It is a question that ought to be answered. If there be those who suppose that the people of this country, as I hold, are not a fickle or ungrateful people—that they are a people who may be mistaken—that they may be misled; but that they are a people who, on the whole, are steadfast in their convictions, and especially in their political convictions, I cannot myself for a moment doubt. I say, then, that as this question, if left unanswered, would show that her majesty's ministers have placed a slur on the character of the people of this kingdom, it ought to be answered; and a short time since, some two months ago, I answered it. It appeared to me, at that moment especially, when all those circumstances to which I have referred were clearly before the country, and when her majesty's government, by their ablest and most powerful representatives, were deploring their unpopularity, and asking the reason why, or rather intimating by inference that it was the fault of the people, not of the government, that some one should give an answer to that question. I gave it, and in a very brief form—in the most condensed and the most severely accurate form. There is not an expression in that description of the conduct of the government which was not well weighed; there was not a word for which I had not warranty, for which I could not adduce testimony ample and abounding. There was only one characteristic of that description which was not noticed at the time, and which I will now confess—it was not original, for six months before, in the House of Commons, I had used the same expressions and made the same statement—not in a hole or corner, but on the most memorable night of the session, when there were six hundred members of the House of Commons present, when on the debate that took place avowedly the fate of the ministry depended. It was at midnight that I rose to speak, and

made the statement almost similar in expression, though perhaps stronger and more lengthened than the one which has become the cause of recent controversy. The prime minister followed me in that debate. The House of Commons knew what was depending upon the verdict about to be taken, and with all that knowledge they came to a division, and by a majority terminated the existence of the government. Gentlemen, it surprises me, then, that, having made that statement six months after, with the advantage of six months more experience and observation, it should have so much offended her majesty's government. The ministers sighed, and their newspapers screamed. The question I have to ask—and in this your interests are vitally concerned—the question is, Was the statement I made a true and accurate one? You cannot answer statements of this kind by saying, "Oh, fie! how very rude." You must at least adduce arguments in order to prove that the statement which you do not sanction is one that ought not to have been made. And therefore I ask you to-day, in the first place, is it or is it not true that the Irish Church has been despoiled? Is it or is it not true that the gentlemen of Ireland have been severely amerced? Is it or is it not true that a royal commission has been issued which has dealt with the ancient endowments of this country in so ruthless a manner that Parliament has frequently been called upon to interfere, and has addressed the crown to arrest their propositions? Are these facts or are they not? Well, I did then venture to say that they had "harassed trades and worried professions," as reasons why men naturally become unpopular. Was that true or was it not? Because, after all, everything depends on the facts of the statement. I won't enter into a long catalogue of trades, commencing with the important trade of which we have heard so much, and which has made itself felt at so many elections, down to the humblest trade—the lucifer-match makers—who fell upon their knees in Palace Yard. I suppose there are some Scotch farmers present, or, at least, those who are intimately connected with them. I want to know whether trade was harassed when a proposition was brought before the House of Commons to tax their carts and horses, and all the machinery of their cultivation. I

know how the proposition was received in England, and I doubt not the Scotch farmers, like the English, felt extremely harassed by it. I want to know what is the reason why there is this crusade throughout the country against schedule D of the income tax. The income tax has been borne for thirty years with great self-sacrifice and with great loyalty by the people of this country. It is at this moment at the lowest pitch it has ever reached; how is it, then, that it is at this moment more unpopular than it was at any time during the long period we endured it at a much higher figure? It is on account of the assessment of the trades of England under that schedule. It is the vexatious and severe assessment that has harassed tradesmen, who, like all those who come under that act, are not particularly pleased, when they are paying five quarters of income tax in the year, to learn also that they are in arrears. Then, have the professions been worried? Ask the military profession—Is it not true that at this moment a royal commission is examining in London into the grievances of six thousand officers? Ask the naval profession whether they have not been worried. During the course of the present government the whole administrative system of the admiralty, the council that had always great influence in the management of the navy, and the peculiar office of the secretary, were all swept away; and in spite, I may say, of the nightly warnings of a right honorable friend who is now lost to us all and his country, the ablest minister of the admiralty during the present reign—notwithstanding his nightly warnings that they were so conducting the administration of the navy that they would probably fall into some disaster, his remonstrances were in vain, till soon the most costly vessel of the state was lost, and the perilous voyage of the "Megæra" had been made, when the country would stand it no longer. They rescinded the whole of this worrying arrangement, and appointed a new first lord to reestablish the old system. Is that worrying a profession, or is it not? Well, gentlemen, I can speak of another profession—a profession the most important in the state—the civil-service profession. Has it been worried? Is it now in a process of worrying, or is it not? There are many even in this room well acquainted with the position of the

civil service in all its departments. I might say the same of the legal profession, for I have heard lawyers on both sides of the House in the debates of last session agree in imploring the government not to continue propositions which would infallibly weaken the administration of justice in this country. It is not only these professions and trades who are directly attacked, but it is every one that is harassed, because no one knows whose turn will come next. Well, I did say to the House of Commons—and I afterward expressed it in another form—I said they had attacked every class and institution from the highest to the lowest in the country. Is that true, or is it not? Is it not a fact that her majesty's government on every occasion of which they could avail themselves during the last three years attacked the authority of the House of Lords, scoffed at the existence of its high functions, and even defied its decisions, until the result proved that the House of Lords was extremely popular in the country, and her majesty's government were obliged to confess that they themselves were exceedingly unpopular? But you must remember this, that the same body who attacked the House of Lords also brought in a bill which would have attacked the poor inheritance of the widow and the orphan. Now, I think I have shown from the highest to the lowest the same system prevailed. What occurred in the interval? The churches of England and Scotland have been threatened. It has been publicly said by the highest authority in the House of Commons that he did not believe that the House of Commons would sanction the views of those who wished to pull down the venerable establishments, but he recommended them to agitate out of doors and endeavor to excite public opinion against them. Then, again, I said jobs were perpetrated that outraged public opinion. Is that true, or is it not? Is it not a fact that two years ago the whole country was outraged by persons being appointed to important offices in church and state in direct violation of the language of acts of parliament?—that the ministry in that respect exercised that dispensing power which forfeited the crown of James II.? Was not public indignation roused to the highest degree upon the Collier appointment and a similar one? Were these acts perpetrated, and did they out-

LORD B

rage public opinion? Every one knows from his own individual experience that public opinion was outraged. I have said, also, that they stumbled into errors which were always discreditable and sometimes ruinous. That was called violent language. Gentlemen, I never use violent language; violent language is generally weak language; but I hope my language is sometimes strong. Now, let us look at this statement. I said that they stumbled into errors which were always discreditable and sometimes ruinous. Was the Zanzibar contract not an "error," and was it not "discreditable"? Was the conduct of the Treasury in allowing a subordinate officer to misappropriate nearly a million of the public money not an "error," and was it not "discreditable"? When the government had referred the Alabama Claims to the arbitrament of a third state, was not the change of the law of nations by the three rules an "error"? Was that not "discreditable," and in its consequences was it not "ruinous"?

I have now given an answer to the question why the government, with transcendent abilities, as they tell us, with magnificent exploits which they are always extolling, and with a country whose prosperity is so palpable—they ask us why they are unpopular, and I tell them why. They have harassed and worried the country, and there was no necessity for any of the acts they have committed. I have put it in condensed, and, I am sure, accurate language. There was an illustrious writer, one of the greatest masters of our language, who wrote the history of the last four years of the reign of Queen Anne, which was the duration of an illustrious ministry. I have written the history of a ministry that has lasted five years, and I have immortalized the spirit of their policy in five lines. And now, gentlemen, I will tell you what is the unfortunate cause of this political embarrassment; why, with such favorable circumstances as the present government have encountered; why, with the great ability which no man is more conscious than myself that they possess; why, with the most anxious and earnest desire, for which I give them entire credit, to do their duty to their sovereign and their fellow countrymen, the result has been so mortifying. I told it two years ago to the assembled county of Lancaster, when I met not only the

greatest proprietors of the soil, but deputations and delegations of the choicest citizens from every town and city of that great county. I told them, speaking with the sense of the deepest responsibility, which, I trust, also animates me now—I told them that the cause was that this government, unfortunately, in its beginning, had been founded on a principle of violence, and that the fatal principle had necessarily vitiated their whole course. And what have we gained by that principle of violence? Let us consider it, here even, with impartiality and perfect candor. I am now referring to the Irish policy of the ministry. I say it is quite possible for public men, with the view of obtaining some great object advantageous to the country, to devise and pass measures which may utterly fail in accomplishing their purpose, and yet, however mortifying to themselves, however disappointing to the country, there would be no stain upon their reputation. We cannot command, but we must endeavor in public life to deserve success. If, therefore, it is said that the government proposed the large measures which they did with respect to Ireland in order to terminate the grievances of years and the embarrassment to England, which the state of Ireland certainly was, although they may have failed, their position was one which still might be a position of respect. That they have failed in this instance no one can doubt. A great portion of Ireland at this moment is in a state of veiled rebellion. But what I charge upon the government is this, not that their measures fail—for all measures may fail—not that their measures fail to prevent or to suppress this veiled rebellion in Ireland, but that their measures, which they brought forward to appease and settle, to tranquilize and consolidate Ireland, are the very cause that this veiled rebellion is taking place. For, gentlemen, what was the principle upon which the whole of their policy with respect to Ireland was founded? What was the principle upon which they induced Parliament to confiscate and to despoil church and private property in Ireland? It was that Ireland must be governed on Irish principles—the administration of Ireland must be carried on with reference to Irish feeling. If that is a sound principle and a sound sentiment in politics, it is a perfect vindication of what is

occurring in the city of Dublin at this moment—viz., an assembly of men whose great and avowed object is to dissever the connection between the two countries. If we are not to legislate for Ireland with reference to imperial feelings and general and national interests—if we are only to legislate with reference to Irish feeling, it is perfectly evident that if there is a majority of the Irish people who may take any idea in the world into their heads, however ruinous to themselves and however fatal to the empire, that policy must be recognized by this country. It is, therefore, to that principle, avowedly and ostentatiously brought forward by the ministry as the basis of their Irish policy, that I trace the dangerous condition in which Ireland is now placed. Well, then, I say this policy of violence for which such sacrifices were made, for which institutions and interests which were, at least, faithful to Britain were sacrificed—this policy of violence has led only to a state of affairs, unfortunately, more unsatisfactory than that which prevailed before.

Now, gentlemen, I observe in the paper that the day is fixed for the reassembling of Parliament. The time is not yet very near, but when you find her majesty has appointed the day for our reassembling, it is an intimation that we must begin to consider the public business a little, and, therefore, it is not altogether inconvenient that we should be talking upon these matters to-day. Now, when we meet parliament, I apprehend the first business that will be brought before us will be the Ashantee war. Upon that subject my mouth is closed. I will not even make an observation upon the railway which I believe has been returned to England. Whenever this country is externally involved in a difficulty, whatever I may think of its cause or origin, those with whom I act, and myself, have no other duty to fulfil but to support the existing government in extricating the country from its difficulties and vindicating the honor and interests of Great Britain. The time will come, gentlemen, no doubt, when we shall know something of the secret history of that mysterious mess of the Ashantee war; but we have now but one duty to fulfil, which is to give every assistance to the government in order that they may take those steps which the interests of the country

require. I should indeed, myself, from my own individual experience, be most careful not to follow the example which one of the most distinguished members of the present administration pursued with respect to us when we had to encounter the Abyssinian difficulty. Mr. Lowe thought proper to rise in parliament when I introduced the necessity of interference in order to escape from difficulties which we had inherited and not created. Mr. Lowe rose in parliament and violently attacked the government of the day for the absurdity, the folly, the extreme imprudence of attempting any interference in the affairs of Abyssinia. He laughed at the honor of the country, he laughed at the interests of a few enslaved subjects of the Queen of England being compared, as he said, with the certain destruction and disaster which must attend any interference on our part. He described the horrors of the country and the terrors of the climate. He said there was no possibility by which any success could be obtained, and the people of England must prepare themselves for the most horrible catastrophe. He described not only the fatal influences of the climate, but I remember he described one pink fly alone, which, he said, would eat up the whole British army. He was as vituperative of the insects of Abyssinia as if they had been British workmen.

Now, gentlemen, there is a most interesting and important subject which concerns us all, and which it is not impossible may be submitted to the consideration of parliament by her majesty's ministers, because I observe a letter published in a newspaper by the authority of the prime minister, which is certainly calculated to arrest public attention. That is a letter respecting the subject of parliamentary reform. I think it is not undesirable that at a moment when letters of this kind are circulated, and when there is a good deal of loose talking prevalent in the country on the subject, that I should take this opportunity of calling your attention to some considerations on this subject which may occupy you after my visit to Glasgow has terminated, and may not be, I think, unprofitable. Her majesty's government are not pledged, but after the letter of the prime minister announcing his own opinion, and the indication of the probability of the government considering the

question of further parliamentary reform, there are two points which the government ought to consider when they come to that question. The first is the expediency of having any further parliamentary reform. They will have to remember that very wise statesmen have been of opinion that there is no more dangerous and feeble characteristic of a state than perpetually to be dwelling on what is called organic change. The habit, it has been said in politics, of perpetually considering your political constitution can only be compared to that of the individual who is always considering the state of his health and his physical constitution. You know what occurs in such circumstances—he becomes infirm and valetudinarian. In fact, there is a school of politics which looks at the English constitution as valetudinarian. They are always looking at its tongue and feeling its pulse, and devising means by which they may give it a tonic. The government will have to consider that very important point, first of all whether it is expedient. I am not giving any opinion upon it—being only a private member of parliament, that is quite unnecessary—but I am indicating the consideration that would occur to a responsible statesman. They will also have to consider this important point: that whatever minister embarks in a campaign of parliamentary reform must make up his mind that he will necessarily arrest the progress of all other public business in the country. I will show you to what extent that consideration should prevail. Parliamentary reform, as a new question, was introduced in the House of Commons in 1852 by Lord John Russell, and from 1852 to 1866, or the end of 1865, it was introduced annually; four prime ministers had pledged themselves to the expediency of parliamentary reform; the subject made no progress in parliament, but took up a great deal of time; a great portion of the parliamentary sessions for these twelve or thirteen years was taken up by discussions on parliamentary reform; and the country got very ill-tempered, finding that no reform was ever advanced, and other and more important subjects were neglected. At last it was taken up by men determined to carry it—first by Lord Russell, who did not carry it, and afterward by others; but, observe, the whole of 1866, 1867, and 1868 were entirely absorbed by the subject of

parliamentary reform. Therefore, you will observe that when important subjects in legislation are neglected you must be prepared to discourage any further demand for parliamentary reform unless you feel an insuperable necessity for it, because if you want parliamentary reform you cannot have any of those great measures with regard to local taxation or other subjects in which you are all so much interested. That is the first consideration for the government of the present day to determine, whether they shall embark in the question of parliamentary reform. Is it necessary? Is the necessity of such a character that it outweighs the immense inconvenience of sacrificing all other public and progressive measures for the advancement of this particular measure? Then there comes another subject of consideration. I dwell upon these subjects because I apprehend that one of the reasons of our meeting this evening is that upon questions which are likely to engage the public attention so far as those whom you honor with your confidence can give you any guidance, it is as well that I should indicate to you briefly my general views of the situation. The next point, therefore, that government will have to consider if they make up their minds to bring forward a measure of parliamentary reform, is the character of the measure, and that will be a most anxious question for them to decide. I think I may say without conceit that the subject of parliamentary reform is one that I am entitled to speak upon at least with some degree of authority. I have given to it the consideration of some forty years, and am responsible for the most important measure on the subject that has been carried. I would say this, that it is impossible to go further in the direction of parliamentary reform than the bill of 1867–68 without entirely subverting the whole of the borough representation of this country. I do not mean to say that if there was a place disfranchised to-morrow for corruption, it would not be possible to enfranchise a very good place in its stead; but, speaking generally, you cannot go beyond the Act of 1867 without making up your mind entirely to break up the borough representation of this country. The people of Great Britain ought to be aware that that is the necessary consequence. So far as I am concerned I never could view the

matter in a party light. If I were to accustom myself to view it in a party light, I might look with unconcern on this difficulty, for the smaller boroughs of the country are not, on the whole, favorable to our views. I am proud to think our party is supported by the great counties, and now to a great extent by great towns and cities; but I do not consider the smaller boroughs favorable to Conservative views. It is the national sympathies and wide sentiments of those who live in our great cities that are much more calculated to rally round the cause in which we are deeply concerned—the greatness and glory of our country. This ought to be known, that if those who intend to have a further measure of parliamentary reform have digested that large meal which they had a few years ago, they should remember that there is no borough in England with under 40,000 inhabitants that would have any claim to be represented even by one member. Now that is a very important consideration if, as we are told, the small boroughs of between 10,000 and 15,000 inhabitants are the backbone of the Liberal party. They may be, and I think they are, but I should be very sorry to see them disfranchised, for they are centers of public spirit and intelligence in the country, influencing very much the districts in which they are situated, and affording a various representation of the mind and life of the country. But it is inevitable that that would occur, and I think, therefore, it ought to be well understood by the country when you hear persons without the slightest consideration saying they are prepared to vote for this, or in favor of that, whereas they have not really mastered the question in any degree whatever. So far as I am concerned, any proposition to change the representation of the people brought forward by her majesty's government will receive my respectful and candid consideration. But I say at once that I will vote for no measure of that kind or of that class which is brought forward by some irresponsible individual who, on the eve of a general election, wants to make a claptrap career. I think it is perfectly disgusting for individuals to jump up in the House of Commons without the slightest responsibility, official or moral, and make propositions which demand the gravest consideration of prolonged and protracted cabinets, with

all the responsibility attaching to experienced statesmen. Now, gentlemen, although I have rather exceeded the time I had intended, there are one or two more remarks I should like to make on subjects which interest us all. And first, as the only feature in our domestic life that gives me uneasiness, are the relations at present between capital and labor, and between the employers and employed. I must say one word upon that subject. If there are any relations in the world which should be those of sympathy and perfect confidence, they always appear to be the relations which should subsist between employers and employed, and especially in manufacturing life. They are, in fact, much more intimate and more necessary relations than those which subsist between landlords and tenants. It is an extremely painful thing that of late years we so frequently hear of misunderstandings between the employers and the employed—that they look upon each other with suspicion—with mutual suspicion—as if each were rapaciously inclined either to obtain or retain the greater share of the profits of their trade; and those incidents with which you are all acquainted, of a very painful nature, have been the consequence. I am not talking of demands for an increase of wages when men are carrying on what is called a roaring trade—I believe that is the classical epithet taken from the Manchester school. When a roaring trade is going on, I am not at all surprised that workingmen should ask for an increase of wages. But a trade sometimes ceases to roar, when wages naturally, on the same principle, assume a form more adapted to the circumstances. No doubt, during the last twenty years there appears to have been, not a passing and temporary cause of disturbance like the incidents of trade being very active or reduced, but some permanent cause disturbing prices, which alike confuses the employer in his calculations as to profits, and embarrasses the employed from the greater expenditure which they find it necessary to make. Now, I cannot but feel myself—having given to the subject as much consideration as I could—I cannot help feeling that the large and continuous increase of the precious metals, especially during the last twenty years, has certainly produced no inconsiderable effect—not only in trade, but no inconsiderable effect in prices. I will not, on an occasion

like this, enter into anything like an abstruse discussion. I confine myself to giving my opinion and the results which I draw from it; and this moral, which I think is worthy of consideration. If it can be shown accurately and scientifically that there is a cause affecting a prominent class, reducing the average remuneration of the employed, and confusing and confounding the employer in his calculations as to profits—if that can be shown, and if it is proved to be the result of inexorable laws, far beyond the reach of legislation, and of circumstances over which human beings have no control—I think if that could be shown, and employers and employed had sufficient acuteness and knowledge—and I am sure that in Scotland both will have to acknowledge that result—it would very much change those mutual feelings of suspicion and sentiments of a not pleasant character which occasionally prevail when they find that they are both of them the victims, as it were, of some inexorable law of political economy which cannot be resisted. I think, instead of supposing that each wanted to take advantage of the other, they would feel inclined to put their shoulders to the wheel, accurately ascertain whether this be true, and come to some understanding which would very much mitigate the relations which subsist between them, and I have little doubt the effect would be to increase the average rate of wages, with my views as to the effect of the continuous increase of the precious metals. But, at the same time, I have not the slightest doubt the employer would, in the nature of things, find adequate compensation for the new position in which he would find himself. There is one point before I sit down to which I wish to call your attention, because if I am correct in saying that the question of the relations between the employer and employed is the only one that gives me anxiety at home, there is a subject abroad to which, I think, I ought, on an occasion like this, to draw your notice; and that is the contest that is commencing in Europe between the spiritual and temporal powers. Gentlemen, I look upon it as very grave, as pregnant with circumstances which may greatly embarrass Europe. The religious sentiment is often and generally taken advantage of by political classes who use it as a pretext; and there is much going on in Europe at the present

moment which, it appears to me, may occasion us soon much anxiety in this community. I should myself look upon it as the greatest danger to civilization if, in the struggle that is going on between faith and free thought, the respective sides should only be represented by the papacy and the red republic; and here I must say that if we have before us the prospect of struggles—perhaps of wars and anarchy, ultimately—caused by the great question that is now rising in Europe, it will not easily be in the power of England entirely to withhold herself from such circumstances. Our connection with Ireland will then be brought painfully to our consciousness, and I should not be at all surprised if the vizor of Home Rule should fall off some day, and you beheld a very different countenance. Now, gentlemen, I think we ought to be prepared for those circumstances. The position of England is one which is indicative of dangers arising from holding a middle course upon those matters. It may be open to England again to take a stand upon the Reformation which three hundred years ago was the source of her greatness and her glory, and it may be her proud destiny to guard civilization alike from the withering blast of atheism and from the simoom of sacerdotal usurpation. These things may be far off, but we live in a rapid age, and my apprehension is that they are nearer than some suppose. If that struggle comes we must look to Scotland to aid us. It was once, and I hope is still, a land of liberty, of patriotism, and of religion. I think the time has come when it really should leave off mumbling the dry bones of political economy and munching the remainder biscuit of an effete Liberalism. We all know that a general election is at hand. I do not ask you to consider on such an occasion the fate of parties or of ministers. But I ask you to consider this, that it is very probable that the future of Europe depends greatly on the character of the next Parliament of England. I ask you, when the occasion comes, to act as becomes an ancient and famous nation, and give all your energies for the cause of faith and freedom.

FERDINAND AUGUST BEBEL

SOCIALISM AND ASSASSINATION

[August Bebel, one of the most conspicuous leaders of the Social-democratic party in German politics, was born in Cologne 1840, and received his early education in the public school of the neighboring village of Brauweiler. He took up wood-turning as a trade, and in 1860 went to Leipsic as a master turner. From 1861 Bebel warmly espoused the cause of labor in Germany, a cause which since the appearance of Lassalle had assumed a distinctly socialistic character. Bebel became a leader in the Mechanics' Institute at Leipsic, and in 1865 was elected president of it. He served in various offices pertaining to labor associations, turning them as much as possible into strictly political clubs, and thus he must be looked upon as one of the founders of the Social-democratic party. He was an active writer for the press, and was hailed as leader by a host of followers, who, in 1871, elected him to the German Reichstag. Since then he has been active in political life. His speeches are bold and outspoken, and on one occasion he caused a sensation throughout Europe by charging the Emperor William with lunacy. He is, however, no fanatic, but a scientific socialist of the latest school. Bebel is a voluminous writer, as well as an eloquent speaker, and is the author of many fresh and clever books, in which are expounded his revolutionary sentiments. His daring but brilliantly expressed ideas have found high favor among those classes in Europe that are inclined toward socialism and kindred principles. The following speech was made on the occasion of the Empress of Austria's assassination, and is a fair exposition of Bebel's socialistic views.]

A LARGE element in the German middle classes has not yet forgotten the law against the socialists. That law's repeal cost the capitalist class bitter pangs. In their distraction they sought some opportunity to replace it with a statute of an exceptional character, or by a stretching of the common law. Their main reliance in this undertaking was Prince Bismarck. Conflict of opinion as to how the socialists were to be dealt with had led to his

retirement. As he never could forget this, he naturally retained his ancient grudge against the social democracy until his dying day. Bismarck caused it to be stated repeatedly in his personal organ, the "Hamburger Nachrichten," that the only way to deal with the social democrats was to drive them to deeds of desperation, pursue them into the streets, and there shoot them down. [Groans.] No demonstration, I beg. Let us rejoice in the frankness of our opponents.

Then came the summer of 1894, with Caserio's attack upon Carnot in Lyons. It might reasonably be asked how Germany can be affected by the occurrence of an assassination in a neighboring country. German citizens were concerned in it neither directly nor indirectly. Nor has so much as an effort to establish the contrary been made in any quarter. Yet the fact that a foreign anarchist in a foreign land had done this deed sufficed to set the German propertied class in motion against the little knot of German anarchists, but still more against the detested Social-democratic party.

There fell, about this time, from a royal mouth, in southwest Germany, the expression that the hour had now come "to beat the general grand march" against social democracy. And at the convention of the national liberal party in Frankfort-on-the-Main, in September of that very year, it was decided, behind locked doors, to implore the government to proceed with a sharpening of the general laws against the social democrats, if not with the new anti-socialist law. That was done. It certainly contributed much to the fall of Caprivi that he was of opinion that any law against the socialists would do more harm than good. He held in this respect a view which in 1890 was the emperor's likewise. But this view ceased to be shared by final authorities, and when Count von Caprivi fell, it was Prince von Hohenlohe who came before the Reichstag with the so-called Revolution Bill. In full session as well as in committee we did all we could to prevent the enactment of the measure. The Roman Catholic party, however, was dominated by the idea of utilizing an increased severity of the criminal laws to reach the so-called intellectual fathers of revolution—the liberal professors with their caustic and

partly atheistic observations. The ultramontanes on the committee, with the conservatives, succeeded in putting the government's demands through with slight modification. At the same time new features were incorporated into the Revolution Bill, which it was hoped would strike emancipated science. On this obstruction the Revolution Bill went finally to pieces. In the face of the stormy opposition of the entire learned and cultivated world, supported by the liberal bourgeoisie, the government had at last to withdraw the bill.

But the desire to dance on the democracy's corpse remained. When the Geneva assassination occurred, in September of the present year, our enemies thought they had gained the upper hand. A few days after the murderous deed, which, as may easily be realized, filled the whole civilized world with consternation, that famous telegram of the capitalist magnates to the emperor, calling for new laws of an exceptional nature, was passed. It ran:—

"The dreadful deed by which her Majesty the Empress of Austria has fallen a victim, reveals by fresh and frightful evidence the goal of anarchy and of all agitation tending in its direction. The profound commotion of our hearts attests that we are one with your majesty in the sense that our duty is to oppose with the sternest statutory measures the attempt to destroy our religion, our love for our noble dynasty, and our love of fatherland. We, the undersigned representatives of German industry, venture therefore with profound deference to give the assurance that we are faithful to your majesty in the struggle against the ruthless enemies of our political and social order. With unalterable confidence in your majesty's capacity and wisdom, we shall support, and further to the utmost, all measures deemed proper by your majesty in defeating the criminal aims of unscrupulous fanaticism, and in upholding the threatened authority of the state."

This despatch was signed by four representatives of the German capitalistic magnate class, as we may dub this element in the empire—men who stand to the fore in all efforts hostile to labor. These gentlemen speak in their telegram of the defense of "our religion." We can only smile at that. For what is the religion of these gentlemen? I fancy I am scarcely mistaken when I conjecture that these gentlemen believe in it about as much as I do, which is not at all. "Religion must be upheld on account of the peo-

ple," was said once, years ago, by a very high authority. But these gentlemen do not put themselves on a level with the people. Religion is to them merely the leading string by means of which the masses are conducted in contentment, subjection, and dependence through this earthly vale of tears.

"Love for our noble dynasty" is likewise alluded to in the telegram. That made me think of an article that appeared in 1892 or 1893 in the "Kolnische Zeitung," whose columns supply these gentlemen with their daily political wisdom. At that time a property tax bill was before the Prussian Landtag. When Von Miguel was shaping the tax laws along more rational lines, he saw that a strict property declaration would be required if the bourgeoisie were to be kept from whistling the treasury down the wind too thoroughly. The result was that the income tax law was followed by a bill to create the so-called total property tax—that is, a moderate tax based upon a compulsory declaration of the value of a man's entire assets. The bourgeoisie were not hard hit by the bill. The property tax, compared with that levied by many Swiss cantons, is extraordinarily low. Yet this measure sufficed to rouse the "Kolnische Zeitung" into fierce opposition. It declared that if such bills were passed by the Prussian Landtag, men would be forced to revise their monarchical convictions. [Laughter.] These gentlemen even discovered that they might eventually find themselves republicans. [Laughter.] They were but rational monarchists—monarchists, that is to say, only because that form of government was most conducive, for the time being, to the advancement of their own interests. Thus did the love of our "noble dynasty" once more assert itself among the bourgeoisie.

And how about the fatherland, that is so often in the mouths of these men? Was not Herr von Hassler, who is the magnate of Germany's textile industries (and who signed the telegram to the emperor) the very one to oppose in 1871—like the Social-democratic party, although from different motives—the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, because he dreaded the competition of the Alsatian textile industries? And it is notorious that every socialist or democrat who then opposed annexation was regarded as

a traitor to his country. Yet Herr von Hassler and the German textile magnates were opposed to it, too. Their love of fatherland must, therefore, have gone to sleep at the bottom of their money-bags. All these fine assurances are but hollow mockeries. They simply serve the purpose of making faction in order that the German working classes may be fettered politically, and in order that they may be put out of the economic position that would enable them to fight successfully their battle with capitalism. That is the secret lurking behind yonder telegram.

Precisely such tactics were employed in 1878, when efforts were made to have it appear that the bloodthirsty Hödel and the unprincipled Nobiling belonged to our party. Then, too, it was their wish to make the laboring people helpless, in order more conveniently to carry out that great scheme for robbing the working classes—the new policy of protective tariff. With perfect justice did the court chaplain's paper say of the despatch then forwarded by the capitalist magnates: "The men who sent such a telegram wanted to exploit their own egoism."

Another business these gentlemen have gone into is that of flinging anarchists and socialists into the same vat. Without letting myself be drawn now into a theoretical discussion of the differences between socialism and anarchy, the mere fact that the adherents of these two movements confront one another in the bitterest hostility, must convince every rightly thinking man that socialism has nothing in common with anarchy, and vice versa. If in Proudhon, Max Stirner, Bakunin, and others, the anarchists behold their intellectual fatherhood, we, on our part, give that recognition as socialists to Marx, Engels, and Lassalle, who always stood in direct opposition to the anarchists. Seldom have two men presented such a striking contrast in all their points of view as Bakunin, who may be styled the father of the propaganda by deed, and Karl Marx, the sworn enemy of every policy of conspiracy and assassination —Bakunin, representative of the most extreme individualism, who saw in plots and in deeds of violence directed against persons in authority a means of attaining his ideal of society; and Karl Marx, who, with Engels, was the founder of the material conception of history, according to

which the power of the individual for good or evil is but limited; thus the individual can wield power in any direction only to the extent that he acts as the representative of special class interests.

Anarchists are the extreme, though logical, development of capitalist liberalism, whose object is almost their own. Socialism, true to the Marx doctrine of the class struggle, is the political representative of the proletariat, which, so far as it has arrived at class consciousness, has organized itself into the Social-democratic party. It aims thus at the acquisition of political power in order to establish a new social system based upon complete equality of rights and complete equality of duties.

The theory that even the most powerful individual can act only as the representative of class interests is illustrated with peculiar clearness by the character of Bismarck. No man had such good reason to hate the Social-democratic party as he, and by nobody was the social democracy more roundly hated than by this very Bismarck. Our mutual love and our mutual hate rested, therefore, upon perfect reciprocity. But in all the socialist press, and in all the socialist literature, there is not so much as a hint that it would be a good thing if this man were put out of the way. Nor in any like situation would we dream of such a thing. But how often has the capitalist press said that had this man not existed we would have to-day no united Germany. There could not be a more contradictory idea. German unity would have been brought about without Bismarck. The conception of unity and freedom was so potent with the German people in the sixties that it would have been carried out either with the Hohenzollerns or without them. The unity of Germany was not alone a political necessity. It was a historical necessity, and above all an economic necessity, chiefly in the interest of the capitalist class and its development. The conception of unity would ultimately have prevailed through sheer elemental force. Therefore Bismarck utilized it for his own ends by realizing it in his own fashion in the interest of the Hohenzollerns, and in the interest, likewise, of the capitalist class and of the landed aristocracy. The proof of this compromise is to be found in the German conception of the empire, which seeks

primarily to reconcile the interests of these three factors. But even a Bismarck was forced to give up his post at last. What a misfortune for Germany, said the press dominated by him. Well, what has happened to Germany since then? Bismarck could not have governed it otherwise than it has been governed.

The basic conception of the comparatively insignificant part which the individual plays in history distinguishes us from the anarchists. Anarchy is, as I said, individualism carried to its logical extreme. No one has shown this more clearly than Stirner in his book, "The Individual and His Property." This notion of the importance of the individual, carried to an extreme, is responsible for the fact that men who do not think clearly, who are easily led by passionate conviction, or who are susceptible to alien and dubious influences and suggestions, suddenly attack isolated individuals in important posts, because they hold such individuals responsible for the evils of society.

Only thus can the notion arise that when an influential individual has been put out of the way a grand and heroic deed has been done for the emancipation of the human race. And to this notion in diseased brains is allied the kindred idea that it matters little what individual be struck down, provided only he belongs to the highest governing class.

If this brainsick notion were not dominant in Luccheni, how could he have murderously assaulted a lady who had never played a political part, who in contrast to many other royal ladies shunned politics, for whom every one must have felt a peculiar respect, because she was intellectually so much above the average of royal ladies, and honored one poet, Heine, as only a social democrat could honor him?

But it would be in the last degree unjust to hold all anarchists responsible for such a deed. The anarchists have reproached us for seeing the hand of the police in every assassination. The "Socialist," which on this account also calls us reactionaries, speaks exactly in this very tone. It says: "We anarchists would do well to assume a critical attitude toward all assassinations and assassination conspiracies that the future may bring forth. We are separated from the reactionaries and from the social demo-

crats, so far as the latter are not to be regarded as reactionaries themselves, in one particular. We do not look at things from points of view which take politics into account. We have rather but a single concern—that of truth."

That this paper should call us reactionaries does not disturb me. The forces of reaction have handled us "reactionaries" without gloves. Herr von Puttkamer has actually dubbed us revolutionists in frock coats and pantaloons. He has said that Johann Most is far less disagreeable to him than we are. I am pleased to think so. If we had done what Most ventured from the safe vantage-ground of a foreign city, we should have provided Bismarck and Puttkamer with a dainty morsel. The article in the "Socialist" on the Luccheni crime is extremely clumsy. If it should come about that a bill dealing in an exceptional way with crimes of violence is presented to the Reichstag, I will wager a thousand to one that this article in the "Socialist" supplies the basis of the measure. But let me tell you, gentlemen of the anarchist movement, that no one can talk themselves to perdition so well as you. How can you put such weapons into the hands of the enemy? You must be wofully lacking in experience still. You will say there is not the slightest harm in it. But people read between the lines. And in "The New Life," also an anarchistic organ, but one quite unfamiliar to me, it is asserted that the Nederwald assassination was planned by anarchists. It is also asserted that only out of cowardice do the social democrats repudiate all connection with anarchy. That seems to me very judicious. If the writer of that article sat in the great red government house on Alexander Place, he could not have written it more suitably for his purpose.

In view of facts like these it is appropriate to draw clear distinctions between the anarchists and ourselves. But it would be unjust to infer from such press outbursts as we have been considering that German anarchists are disposed to plot assassination.

What do our German anarchists now regard as their chief task? To form the workers into associations and organize cooperative unions, to which they attribute a marked influence in the sociological field. I do not hold that view. Necessary and useful as associations may be,

we all agree that of themselves they accomplish nothing. The same is true of the cooperative unions, which, however, do a certain amount of good, provided always they are properly managed. I am not opposed to their formation, but I make no efforts to bring them into existence. Thirty-five years ago I founded a cooperative union, and subsequently vowed never to do such a thing again. But nothing can be said against cooperative unions as such. Many social democrats, especially in Saxony, belong to them, even though they afford no economic cure-all. But to say of people who want to found associations and cooperative unions that they are planning assassination is most infamous slander.

We appreciate the law of evolution. Natural as is the longing of the toiling masses to be freed from want and from political and economic oppression to-day rather than to-morrow, we know that our end cannot be gained until the general evolution—which we seek to further by organizing the working classes for the coming struggle—is so far advanced that our power is strong enough to revolutionize society. From this point of view we may and shall regard as foes and stoutly antagonize powerful individuals who oppose us. Never, however, could we entertain the notion that the putting of such individuals violently out of the way would result in a decided step forward for us. The exact opposite would be the case. Reaction would gain the upper hand. Such we see is the outcome of assassination in Italy, France, Belgium, Russia, and, by no means last, in Germany.

Our capitalistic opponents should be the very last to cherish indignation against the anarchists. The theory of the preponderant influence over the course of history exercised by powerful individuals in high position is wholly of capitalist origin. The belief that putting a powerful individual out of the way is a great event historically has derived encouragement from no class more than from the propertied one. The rule holds good from the days of the ancient Greeks to our own. Harmodius and Aristogeiton, who slew the tyrant Hipparchus 514 years before Christ, are proclaimed to-day in the colleges as heroes and saviors of the people. Let me also recall Marianna, the famous

Jesuit, who stated the circumstances in which an individual is justified in taking the life of a tyrant, as he styles a prince who governs absolutely at his own will and pleasure. The work in which these views are set forth is entitled "De Rege et Regis Institutione," and was burnt in 1609 by order of a Spanish court. The Jesuit regarded every prince who proscribed the Catholic Church and its ministers as a tyrant. And how does Schiller view the deed of Tell? And what was this Tell—the Tell of the poem? A murderer who from a place of safety shot down Gessler, whom he looked upon as the enemy of his country and the cause of his own oppression. Gessler was a tyrant in the sense that all absolute princes are tyrants in the eyes of the tax-paying propertied classes. I would mention, too, Schiller's poem beginning with the lines:—

> "To Dionysius, tyrant lord,
> Stole Damon with the hidden sword."

Not a line in this poem indicates that Schiller condemns Damon for his course. On the contrary, he is praised for his heroic courage and for the lofty motive of his conduct.

I have here a list of the assassinations perpetrated during the last hundred years. This list does not purport to be complete, and yet I am surprised at the number of assassinations it records for the nineteenth century. Violence, moreover, was done to Henry III. of France, by a Dominican monk in 1589, and to Henry IV. of France by the teacher Ravaillac in 1610. Charles I. of England was executed by order of the Long Parliament under Cromwell in 1649. Pope Clement XIV. was poisoned, it seems, by the Jesuits, whose order he had suppressed, in 1773. Louis XV. of France was the object of an attempted murder by Damien in 1757, as was Gustave III. of Sweden on the part of Count Ankarström in 1792. An attempt was made on Paul I. of Russia, as the result of a conspiracy of nobles, at the head of which were Count Palen and a Herr von Bennigsen. An effort by means of an infernal machine was made to assassinate Napoleon I. while he was consul in 1809, by the German Stapss. The theological student Ludwig Sand in 1819 tried to slay Kotzebue, a Russian spy, in Mannheim. It is interesting to note here that

Sand's attack on Kotzebue was generally applauded by German students and citizens. Indeed, a doctor of theology at the University of Berlin, Professor de Wette, felt called upon to write Sand's afflicted mother a letter of condolence, in which he said, among other things: "The opinion of the great majority may brand your son as a criminal, and perhaps with some show of reason. As I venture to form my own opinion on the subject, I am prompted to make myself his advocate with you and shield his name from censure, at least within the limits of his own family."

The king was informed that De Wette had written this letter, and he was at once deprived of his professorship. He left Berlin after writing to the king that he had poor health, was without wife or property, father of two young children, "and bore all this burden uncrushed." De Wette afterward became a professor at Basel.

An attack was made upon the Duke of Berry by Lavel in 1820. Seven attempts were made upon Louis Philippe of France, among them that of Fieschi, in which fourteen persons were killed, including Marshal Mortier, in 1835. An attempt was made to assassinate Frederick William IV. by Tschech in 1845, and by Sefeloge in 1850. Attempts upon Francis Joseph of Austria occurred in 1849 and 1853, upon Minister Count Rossi at Rome in 1848, Duke Charles of Parma in 1854, Ferdinand III. of Naples in 1856, three attempts upon Napoleon III.—two in 1855, and the Orsini attempt, in which 137 persons were killed or wounded, in 1858. Attempts were made upon William I. by Becker in Baden-Baden in 1861, and by Hödel and Nobiling in 1878. Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, was shot by the actor Booth in 1865. General Prim was attacked in 1870. Prince Bismarck's assassination was attempted by Cohen-Blind in 1866 and by Kullman in 1874. Five attempts were made upon Alexander II. of Russia, one ending fatally in 1881. Lord Cavendish, Viceroy of Ireland, and Under-Secretary of State Burke were assassinated by Fenians in Phœnix Park, Dublin, in 1882. An effort to slay Isabella of Spain was made by a priest in 1856. Four attempts were made upon Queen Victoria of England in 1840, 1842, 1872, and 1882, in connection with which it

should be noted that not one of these attempts led to exceptional statute-making or to severer interpretation of the common law. Attacks were made upon Prince Michael III. of Servia in 1868, on King Humbert of Italy in 1878, on President Garfield in 1881. An attempt was made on Crispi in 1889. The Bulgarian minister, Beltschaff, was murdered in mistake for Stambuloff in 1891. The murder of Stambuloff himself was effected by Russian government agents in 1895. Carnot, President of the French republic, was attacked by Caserio in 1894. Canovas, the Spanish premier, became a victim in 1897. The assassination of the King of Greece was attempted in 1897. The murder of the Empress of Austria by Luccheni occurred in 1898.

The many assassinations which have taken place in Russia alone in the course of the past twenty years, the political and royal murders that have happened in Turkey and Persia, and finally the numerous political murders in South American states I shall allude to only in general terms.

The judgment of various classes of propertied citizens upon Cohen-Blind's attempt on Bismarck in 1866 was most characteristic. Thus Hopf, member of the Wurtemburg Landtag, and later of the German Reichstag, wrote in the "Gradaus": "So long as Germany numbers such youths [as Cohen-Blind] among her sons, she is not poor." Marie Kurz lauded Cohen-Blind for his deed in a poem. A Munich comic paper showed the devil repelling the murderer's revolver with the words: "Stop! He belongs to me."

On December 8, 1856, the soldier Agesilaus Milano made the attempt already mentioned to assassinate Ferdinand II. of Naples, because of the bombardment of the city ordered by the so-called King Bomba. The would-be murderer was summarily executed. But when Garibaldi, supported by Victor Emmanuel, drove the Bourbons out of Naples in 1860, he issued a decree in which, as a mark of honor to the dead man, the would-be murderer's mother was given a pension of thirty ducats monthly, while his sisters were granted a dowry of 2,000 ducats each. This decree was respected in entire good faith by the Italian monarch. Yet this monarchy, which pensioned the rela-

tives of an assassin, now dares to call an anti-anarchist conference.

No class, no rank in society is exempt from the reproach of having furnished assassins. But all the assassinations have been absolutely without influence upon the progress of events. Things took their course regardless of them.

What good was done by the general slaughter and the tyrannicide of the French republic? Louis XVI. was certainly a blameless little man, yet he and Marie Antoinette had to lay their heads upon the block charged with being tyrants. Hundreds of nobles and priests followed them to the guillotine. But all these murders and massacres could not prevent the restoration of the monarchy. The priests gained such power as they had scarcely ever wielded before. One thing, however, the restored Bourbons, supported by the bayonets of all Europe, could not change—the new social order brought about by the French Revolution, partly by the division of the estates of the absconded nobles and clergy among millions of the peasantry, and partly by the great civil code that became the model of all progressive states on the European continent. Thus it was that feudalism went down. Thirteen years after the restoration of the Bourbons they had to get out of France again, never to return.

Change the social system from its foundations upward, rear an appropriate political superstructure, and opponents may be allowed to keep their heads on their shoulders in peace.

It is beyond dispute that there are anarchists who attempt assassination. Caserio's deed was a genuine anarchist crime, as was the act of Luccheni. But this does not preclude suspicion that people stood behind Luccheni, made use of his simplicity, and urged him to his deed. Reinsdorf, too, who made an attempt upon the assembled German princes at the dedication of the Nederwald monument, was a genuine anarchist. That did not prevent the police factotum, Weber Palm, from mixing himself up in the proceedings and taking part in the preparations of the conspirators. I may add that the assassination was to be effected by means of self-acting dynamite that had been previously tested in Elberfeld. There an attempt was

made to blow up a restaurant, but it failed because the dynamite was good for nothing. [Laughter.] In the Nederwald the rain luckily put the fuse out.

Let us now consider the many occasions on which the police have participated in assassinations and in attempted assassinations during the past century. When Bismarck was envoy at Frankfort-on-the-Main he wrote his wife: "The police, for want of facts, lie and exaggerate wildly."

Police agents are hired to ferret out projected assassinations. Doubtful characters are found among them—good ones do not accept such posts—and the thought presents itself: since other people do not plot assassination, we must supply the deficiency. If they cannot report that something is going on they will appear superfluous, and that, naturally, they do not want. So they mend matters, to adopt a French proverb, by "correcting fortune." Or they do a little political business on their own account. It is only necessary to refer, in proof of this, to the memoirs of the former police prefect in Paris, Andrieux. He confesses cynically that he subsidized extreme anarchist organs out of the police funds, and got up anarchist conspiracies, merely to keep the capitalists in a suitable state of terror. There was also the notorious London police inspector, Melville, who labored to the same purpose. This was demonstrated by the investigation into the so-called Walsall crime. Even among the Fenian outrages several were of police origin, as the Parnell case revealed.

The activities of the scoundrel Pourbaix in Belgium are a matter of recent recollection. The minister of the crown, Bernaard, was forced to admit in Parliament that Pourbaix was paid to manufacture assassination conspiracies that would seem to justify forcible measures against the socialists. The so-called Bomb-Baron von Ungern-Sternberg was unmasked during the Lüttich anarchist trial as a paid agent of the police. Then there are our old friends of the anti-socialist-law days. I could sing a pretty little song about them, for I played a part at their unmasking. There was, for instance, Schröder-Brennwald in Zurich, the fellow who received two hundred marks a month from the police commissioner, Krüger, an allowance afterward raised to two hundred and fifty marks a month. In every meeting in

Zurich this Schröder vociferated and advocated acts of violence. To prevent the Swiss authorities from expelling him he became, presumably at Prussia's expense, a Swiss citizen. Of course he may have saved his money for the purpose. Schröder and the police anarchist, Kaufmann, called a conference in Zurich in the summer of 1883, in which thirteen persons took part. Schröder was in the chair. At this conference murders in Vienna, Stuttgart, and Strasburg were planned and subsequently carried out by Stellmacher, Kammerer, and Kumitsch. I am not informed that these unprincipled scoundrels told the police such murders were contemplated. Stellmacher and Kammerer paid the penalty of their misdeeds on the gallows. When Most was in prison in England Schröder had the "Freiheit" printed himself. He certainly didn't pay the bills out of his own pocket.

There were fine times in those days when Schröder and the creature Haupt were exposed. Police-commissioner Krüger had written them that he knew the next assassination conspiracy would be directed against the Czar of Russia from Geneva, and full reports must be sent in. Were not these wonderful instructions?

Then there was Herr von Ehrenberg, the former artillery captain. He was rightly suspected of having sold to the Italians the secret of the Swiss fortifications of St. Gothard. Investigation brought to light the fact that Herr von Ehrenberg, too, was in the pay of the Prussian police. He had prepared elaborate reports of the conversations held by himself with our people, including me, it appears. Only he had turned the talk about. Those vast plans were matured and urged upon us and put into our mouths by him, while he represented himself as the one to whom they had been proposed by us. What might not have happened had those reports fallen into certain hands, and those whom they accused had been without witnesses to prove the utter falsity of all they contained! For instance, he had tried to convince me—although his report made me the author of the proposition—that it would be the easiest thing in the world to put a certain mark on the house doors of the higher military officials in all the leading German towns, and then send our trustiest men to murder

them in the night. He wrote a series of four able articles for the Zurich "Arbeiterstimme," in which he showed how a modern street battle could be conducted, and what arrangements ought to be made to dispose of the artillery and cavalry. He also advocated taking up collections in our meetings to buy weapons for our people. The moment a war broke out with France, our comrades were to dash out of Switzerland into Baden and Wurtemburg, tear up the railway tracks, and smash the cars and stations. And this fellow who urged all these things was in the pay of the Prussian police!

Another creature in the pay of the police was the notorious Friedemann who was driven out of Berlin, and who incited our comrades to acts of violence by means of his prose and verse, which he read at meetings in Zurich. Near Basel a certain Weiss, supposed to be a tinker, was arrested for distributing placards in which the deeds of Kammerer and Stellmacher were praised. He, too, as was proved in court, received pay from the German police. One Schmidt, who had to leave Dresden on account of his thefts, went to Zurich and established an assassination fund, giving twenty francs himself as the first contribution. He was another police tool. Then there was the secret-service officer, Ihring-Mahlow, here in Berlin, who offered to give instruction in the preparation of explosives, because parliamentary methods were too slow!

What I am now telling you does not rest upon gossip and rumor. It can all be proved at any time. After such experiences as these have we not every reason to ask after an assassination like that in Geneva: Who is behind it? To be sure, Luccheni is an anarchist. But, like Hödel, he is a man neglected from his youth, ruined and degraded by the brutalizing conditions under which he was reared. Born out of wedlock, he grew up at first in the foundling asylum, and in later boyhood was utterly neglected. He had to earn his bread from the time he was ten, now here, now there. Thus he grew into the man who allowed himself to be led into such a senseless murder as that of the Austrian empress. But the question upon which, it is to be hoped, light will be thrown at the coming trial in Geneva is: Did he do it on his own responsibility or at the prompting of

others? In Geneva and throughout Switzerland, long before Luccheni committed his murder, Italian police spies of the worst sort, like Santoro, Mantica, Benedicti, and others, plied their traffic in the vilest ways and places.

In August of this year a number of strikes were in progress in Vienna, especially among the building trades. The leaders, Italian socialists, tried to effect a peace between the contending parties. They succeeded, but they were banished in the most singular fashion for doing so. Santoro and Mantica openly took a hand in these proceedings. According to our Swiss comrades, the Italian consul-general was used by them as a tool. They had the Italians harassed by the police until the latter resolved upon their banishment. But, strangely enough, the real instigators of the strike remained unmolested, and yet they must have been known to the police. Then came Luccheni's act, and a light dawned upon the police. The wretches who had been plying their calling in Geneva were studied with more attention. Significant facts came out. The records of some of them were dark with crimes previously committed in Italy, but several of them were, notwithstanding, in the pay of the Italian political police.

Is it strange, therefore, that our party organ in Berne, the "Tagwacht," flatly asserted that Luccheni's crime was an Italian police assassination? The paper was not called to account for this statement. The record of these creatures of the Italian police shows them capable of anything evil and underhanded. Who, for instance, is Santoro? He was a police commissioner in Florence once. Bomb throwings became frequent in Italy in 1891. In Florence one night the police arrested a suspicious-looking man who carried something hidden under a cloak. The thing turned out to be a bomb, but the cloak under which he carried the bomb was Santoro's. The man in the cloak, De Angeli, went to prison, but Santoro became, through Crispi, director of the penal colony of Porto-Ercola. There he maltreated the convicts so frightfully that a number of them died. He robbed the prisoners of their food, and appropriated the money sent to the poor wretches by their relatives. When Santoro's infamous conduct came to light, his only punishment was removal. Thereupon he served

the radical deputy Cavalotti against Crispi, by betraying the latter's misdeeds. The result was that Santoro was brought up for his crimes and cruelties in Porto-Ercola and punished with eight years in prison. But he found means to get out, and went to Switzerland, once more in the service of the Italian police.

Now for Mantica. He was expelled from the corps of Italian military officers for some reason unknown to me. He tried to bribe the jury in a lawsuit in Sicily, and in February 1898 was sentenced to thirteen months in prison. He got away, too, and like Santoro went to Switzerland in the pay of the Italian police. He had intimate relations with the Italian consul-general in Geneva, Basso, who shortly after the Geneva assassination was transferred to Corsica. Mantica went about in Geneva under assumed names, lived in fine style, dabbled in journalism and roguery, and was able to send word of the assassination to Italy before anybody else had wind of it. His associates were anarchists, whom he followed up assiduously, and discredited socialists. The proceedings against Luccheni should show whether the Italian police anarchists can fairly be charged with being directly implicated in Luccheni's act. But there is no more notion of enacting special laws in Switzerland as a result of the Geneva assassination than there is in England, and this shows the vast difference that exists between a democratic country and Germany. Indeed, Swiss official circles, as well as the people, are incensed against the Italian government, which sends rascals of police agents into the country, and then has the assurance to want to lay down administrative measures for Switzerland.

The Italian police, too, were not without their share of responsibility for the criminal developments recently reported from Egypt.

If ever a conspiracy bore on its face evidence of police implication, it is, apparently, the one lately unearthed in Alexandria. It is significant that the first news of it came from England. A box filled with bombs will have to be found soon in an Italian boarding-house. I believe it will soon be found, too. It was known long ago where it was. [Laughter.] It was left with an Italian landlord named

Parrini, who, thinking it contained cognac, wanted to open it with a hammer in the presence of the police. The police organs say it was his evident intention to be blown into the air. Oh, no! He may have wished, innocently enough, to break open the box. But the others knew what was in it. They had no evident intention to be blown into the air. Only Italians seem to be mixed up in this conspiracy. How fortunate! The Italian consul can do all the investigating himself. Copies of the Neuchatel "Agitator" were found on the prisoners, urging the assassination of King Humbert. That shows lively imagination. Were it true, the Berne federal council would not have banished the editor of that paper. He could have been sentenced to a number of years in prison, in accordance with the well-known Swiss law against inciting to acts of violence.

So it is a case of petty humbug. But even were it all true, what has Germany to do with what goes on down in Alexandria, where gather the most dubious characters of all Europe?

But assuming that Italians really were mixed up in the affair, there would be nothing to wonder at in that. It is, unfortunately, beyond dispute that many Italians are easily incited to acts of violence. This accounts for the very strong prejudice that exists in Switzerland against Italian working men. The knife is too easily whipped out with many of them. It is well known that an uprising against the Italians took place in Zurich two years ago because one of them stabbed a Swiss to death in a trivial dispute. These and similar things happen repeatedly in Switzerland week after week. Swiss prisons are for this reason filled with Italians. Such events, regularly reported in the newspapers, account for the strong feeling against the many Italians in Switzerland, who are, however, for the most part, cheap and industrious workmen, two qualifications which recommend them to employers. But are the Italians naturally bloodthirsty? One cannot say that. But they are most superstitious, ignorant, and, as regards education, neglected. Centuries of shameful and time-honored abuses, calculated to impress the people with a sense of their lack of human rights, have made the impulse to act in their own behalf very strong with them. The man of the people

therefore makes his own law for himself. He does the same when abroad, even in a land of equitable rights, because, in accordance with what he learned at home, self-help seems to him the surest. This notion of self-help is carried to the extreme of license, and has the evil consequences from which Switzerland suffers so much. It is a known fact that thousands of young Italians, in consequence of the unfortunate social conditions prevailing in their native land, are forced yearly to seek a livelihood in foreign countries. When in the fifth and sixth decades of the present century Italy achieved her unity, the great majority of European peoples hailed the fact with rejoicing, because it would sweep away in the Italian states—the States of the Church included—conditions that were a disgrace to the civilized world. The house of Savoy, in whose interest, primarily, this unity was established, seemed destined to bring about a modern order of civilization. But no European land has been governed to destruction in a few decades so effectually as the kingdom of Italy. Aristocracy and bourgeoisie together have plundered in a way that has made matters worse than they ever were before. The heavy indirect taxes collected in Italy far exceed those levied in Germany. Every loaf of bread pays a duty in south Italy. Wages are miserable. Agricultural conditions are frightful. Whole stretches of country lie waste. The proprietors of the soil, aristocrats and capitalists both, are too slothful, too incompetent, too abject. They prefer to squander in the beautiful cities and resorts of the land the money they squeeze from the peasants and workmen. The peasant groans under the worst tenantry system imaginable by man. The land taxes yield 300,000,000 francs annually. But the poor peasant must pay them.

When conditions such as these are taken into account we begin to realize who the real assassins are. In the immediate vicinity of holy Rome, venerable seat of European civilization, lie the Pontine marshes, whose fever-breath drives life away. But the Italian government has no money to transform them into blooming pasture land. Yet the inhabitants of the land are there, for officials to plunder. To maintain a mighty army and a great fleet hundreds and hundreds of millions of taxes are levied, and they

have well-nigh crushed the toiling people to earth. And at a time when conditions prevail of which it may be truly said they cry aloud to Heaven, the Italian government dares to call an anti-anarchist conference. Not the anarchists, but the Italian ministry, should be summoned to account. They ought to be in jail!

HENRY WARD BEECHER

RAISING THE FLAG OVER FORT SUMTER

[Henry Ward Beecher, an American clergyman and publicist, endowed beyond any person of his day with the gift of "burning speech," was born in Connecticut in 1813. He graduated at Amherst and began the study of theology at Lane Seminary. When his studies were completed he became pastor of a church in Indiana. His eloquence in the pulpit only gradually developed. In his thirty-fourth year he went to Brooklyn and assumed the pastorate of Plymouth Church there. His genius had now attained maturity. One of the largest congregations in the country regularly assembled to hear him. Popular pressure forced him upon the platform. By the time the Civil War was at its height he had become a commanding figure, his speeches sharing with those of John Bright the distinction of having revolutionized English opinion on the subject of the merits of the struggle. Beecher advocated not only the abolition of slavery, however, but in his later years was a champion of temperance and of woman's rights. At his death in 1887 he was by general consent pronounced the most conspicuous figure in the American pulpit during the quarter of a century beginning with the year 1862. This was a long time during which to maintain such supremacy. The following oration was delivered April 14, 1865, at the close of the Civil War, the same day on which President Lincoln was assassinated.]

ON this solemn and joyful day we again lift to the breeze our fathers' flag, now again the banner of the United States, with the fervent prayer that God would crown it with honor, protect it from treason, and send it down to our children, with all the blessings of civilization, liberty, and religion. Terrible in battle, may it be beneficent in peace. Happily, no bird or beast of prey has been inscribed upon it. The stars that redeem the night from darkness, and the beams of red light that beautify the morning, have been united upon its folds. As long as the sun endures, or the stars, may it wave over a nation neither

enslaved nor enslaving! Once, and but once, has treason dishonored it. In that insane hour when the guiltiest and bloodiest rebellion of all time hurled their fires upon this fort, you, sir [turning to General Anderson], and a small, heroic band, stood within these now crumbled walls, and did gallant and just battle for the honor and defense of the nation's banner. In that cope of fire, that glorious flag still peacefully waved to the breeze above your head, unconscious of harm as the stars and skies above it. Once it was shot down. A gallant hand, in whose care this day it has been, plucked it from the ground, and reared it again—"cast down, but not destroyed." After a vain resistance, with trembling hand and sad heart, you withdrew it from its height, closed its wings, and bore it far away, sternly to sleep amid the tumults of rebellion and the thunder of battle. The first act of war had begun. The long night of four years had set in. While the giddy traitors whirled in a maze of exhilaration, dim horrors were already advancing, that were ere long to fill the land with blood. To-day you are returned again. We devoutly join with you in thanksgiving to Almighty God that He has spared your honored life, and vouchsafed to you the honors of this day. The heavens over you are the same, the same shores; morning comes, and evening, as they did. All else, how changed! What grim batteries crowd the burdened shores! What scenes have filled this air and disturbed these waters! These shattered heaps of shapeless stone are all that is left of Fort Sumter. Desolation broods in yonder sad city—solemn retribution hath avenged our dishonored banner! You have come back with honor, who departed hence four years ago, leaving the air sultry with fanaticism. The surging crowds that rolled up their frenzied shouts as the flag came down, are dead, or scattered, or silent, and their habitations are desolate. Ruin sits in the cradle of treason. Rebellion has perished. But there flies the same flag that was insulted. With starry eyes it looks all over this bay for the banner that supplanted it, and sees it not. You that then, for the day, were humbled, are here again, to triumph once and forever. In the storm of that assault this glorious ensign was often struck; but, memorable fact, not one of its stars was torn out by shot or shell. It was a

prophecy. It said: "Not one state shall be struck from this nation by treason!" The fulfilment is at hand. Lifted to the air to-day, it proclaims that after four years of war, "not a state is blotted out." Hail to the flag of our fathers, and our flag! Glory to the banner that has gone through four years black with tempests of war, to pilot the nation back to peace without dismemberment! And glory be to God, who, above all hosts and banners, hath ordained victory, and shall ordain peace. Wherefore have we come hither, pilgrims from distant places? Are we come to exult that northern hands are stronger than southern? No, but to rejoice that the hands of those who defend a just and beneficent government are mightier than the hands that assaulted it. Do we exult over fallen cities? We exult that a nation has not fallen. We sorrow with the sorrowful. We sympathize with the desolate. We look upon this shattered fort and yonder dilapidated city with sad eyes, grieved that men should have committed such treason, and glad that God hath set such a mark upon treason that all ages shall dread and abhor it. We exult, not for a passion gratified, but for a sentiment victorious; not for temper, but for conscience; not, as we devoutly believe, that our will is done, but that God's will hath been done. We should be unworthy of that liberty entrusted to our care, if, on such a day as this, we sullied our hearts by feelings of aimless vengeance, and equally unworthy if we did not devoutly thank Him who hath said: "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord," that He hath set a mark upon arrogant rebellion, ineffaceable while time lasts.

Since this flag went down on that dark day, who shall tell the mighty woes that have made this land a spectacle to angels and men? The soil has drunk blood and is glutted. Millions mourn for millions slain, or, envying the dead, pray for oblivion. Towns and villages have been razed. Fruitful fields have turned back to wilderness. It came to pass, as the prophet said: "The sun was turned to darkness, and the moon to blood." The course of law was ended. The sword sat chief magistrate in half the nation; industry was paralyzed; morals corrupted; the public weal invaded by rapine and anarchy; whole states ravaged by avenging armies The world was amazed. The earth reeled.

When the flag sank here, it was as if political night had come, and all beasts of prey had come forth to devour. That long night has ended. And for this returning day we have come from afar to rejoice and give thanks. No more war. No more accursed secession. No more slavery, that spawned them both. Let no man misread the meaning of this unfolding flag! It says: "Government hath returned hither." It proclaims, in the name of vindicated government, peace and protection to loyalty, humiliation and pains to traitors. This is the flag of sovereignty. The nation, not the states, is sovereign. Restored to authority, this flag commands, not supplicates. There may be pardon, but no concession. There may be amnesty and oblivion, but no honeyed compromises. The nation to-day has peace for the peaceful, and war for the turbulent. The only condition of submission is to submit! There is the Constitution, there are the laws, there is the government. They rise up like mountains of strength that shall not be moved. They are the conditions of peace. One nation, under one government, without slavery, has been ordained, and shall stand. There can be peace on no other basis. On this basis reconstruction is easy, and needs neither architect nor engineer. Without this basis no engineer or architect shall ever reconstruct these rebellious states. We do not want your cities nor your fields. We do not envy you your prolific soil, nor heavens full of perpetual summer. Let agriculture revel here; let manufacturers make every stream twice musical; build fleets in every port; inspire the arts of peace and genius second only to that of Athens, and we shall be glad in your gladness, and rich in your wealth. All that we ask is unswerving loyalty and universal liberty. And that, in the name of this high sovereignty of the United States of America, we demand; and that, with the blessing of Almighty God, we will have! We raise our fathers' banner that it may bring back better blessings than those of old; that it may cast out the devil of discord; that it may restore lawful government, and a prosperity purer and more enduring than that which it protected before; that it may win parted friends from their alienation; that it may inspire hope, and inaugurate universal liberty; that it may say to the sword, "Return to thy sheath"; and to the plow and

sickle, "Go forth"; that it may heal all jealousies, unite all policies, inspire a new national life, compact our strength, purify our principles, ennoble our national ambitions, and make this people great and strong, not for aggression and quarrelsomeness, but for the peace of the world, giving to us the glorious prerogative of leading all nations to juster laws, to more humane policies, to sincerer friendship, to rational, instituted civil liberty, and to universal Christian brotherhood. Reverently, piously, in hopeful patriotism, we spread this banner on the sky, as of old the bow was painted on the cloud, and, with solemn fervor, beseech God to look upon it and make it a memorial of an everlasting covenant and decree that never again on this fair land shall a deluge of blood prevail. Why need any eye turn from this spectacle? Are there not associations which, overleaping the recent past, carry us back to times when, over North and South, this flag was honored alike by all? In all our colonial days we were one; in the long revolutionary struggle and in the scores of prosperous years succeeding. When the passage of the Stamp Act in 1765 aroused the colonies, it was Gadsden, of South Carolina, that cried, with prescient enthusiasm, "We stand on the broad common ground of those natural rights that we all feel and know as men. There ought to be no New England man, no New Yorker, known on this continent, but all of us," said he, "Americans." That was the voice of South Carolina. That shall be the voice of South Carolina. Faint is the echo; but it is coming. We now hear it sighing sadly through the pines; but it shall yet break in thunder upon the shore. No North, no West, no South, but one United States of America. There is scarcely a man born in the South who has lifted his hand against this banner but had a father who would have died for it. Is memory dead? Is there no historic pride? Has a fatal fury struck blindness or hate into eyes that used to look kindly toward each other, that read the same Bible, that hung over the historic pages of our national glory, that studied the same Constitution? Let this uplifting bring back all of the past that was good, but leave in darkness all that was bad. It was never before so wholly unspotted, so clear of all wrong, so purely and simply the sign of justice and liberty. Did I

say that we brought back the same banner that you bore away, noble and heroic sir? It is not the same. It is more and better than it was. The land is free from slavery since that banner fell.

When God would prepare Moses for emancipation, He overthrew his first steps and drove him for forty years to brood in the wilderness. When our flag came down, four years it lay brooding in darkness. It cried to the Lord, "Wherefore am I deposed?" Then arose before it a vision of its sin. It had strengthened the strong, and forgotten the weak. It proclaimed liberty, but trod upon slaves. In that seclusion it dedicated itself to liberty. Behold, to-day it fulfils its vows! When it went down four million people had no flag. To-day it rises, and four million people cry out, "Behold our banner!" Hark! they murmur. It is the Gospel that they recite in sacred words: "It is a gospel to the poor, it heals our broken hearts, it preaches deliverance to captives, it gives sight to the blind, it sets at liberty them that are bruised." Rise up then, glorious Gospel banner, and roll out these messages of God. Tell the air that not a spot now sullies thy whiteness. Thy red is not the blush of shame, but the flush of joy. Tell the dews that wash thee that thou art as pure as they. Say to the night that thy stars lead toward the morning; and to the morning, that a brighter day arises with healing in its wings. And then, O glorious flag! bid the sun pour light on all thy folds with double brightness while thou art bearing round and round the world the solemn joy—a race set free! a nation redeemed! The mighty hand of government, made strong in war by the favor of the God of battles, spreads wide to-day the banner of liberty that went down in darkness, that arose in light; and there it streams, like the sun above it, neither parceled out nor monopolized, but flooding the air with light for all mankind. Ye scattered and broken, ye wounded and dying, bitten by the fiery serpents of oppression, everywhere, in all the world, look upon this sign, lifted up, and live! And ye homeless and houseless slaves, look, and ye are free! At length you, too, have part and lot in this glorious ensign that broods with impartial love over small and great, the poor and the strong, the bond and the free. In this solemn

hour, let us pray for the quick coming of reconciliation and happiness under this common flag. But we must build again, from the foundations, in all these now free southern states. No cheap exhortations "to forgetfulness of the past, to restore all things as they were," will do. God does not stretch out His hand, as He has for four dreadful years, that men may easily forget the might of His terrible acts. Restore things as they were! What, the alienations and jealousies, the discords and contentions, and the causes of them? No! In that solemn sacrifice on which a nation has offered up for its sins so many precious victims, loved and lamented, let our sins and mistakes be consumed utterly and forever. No, never again shall things be restored as before the war. It is written in God's decree of events fulfilled, "old things are passed away." That new earth, in which dwelleth righteousness, draws near. Things as they were! Who has an omnipotent hand to restore a million dead, slain in battle or wasted by sickness, or dying of grief, broken-hearted? Who has omniscience to search for the scattered ones? Who shall restore the lost to broken families? Who shall bring back the squandered treasure, the years of industry wasted, and convince you that four years of guilty rebellion and cruel war are no more than dirt upon the hand, which a moment's washing removes and leaves the hand clean as before? Such a war reaches down to the very vitals of society. Emerging from such a prolonged rebellion, he is blind who tells you that the state, by a mere amnesty and benevolence of government, can be put again, by a mere decree, in its old place. It would not be honest, it would not be kind or fraternal, for me to pretend that southern revolution against the Union has not reacted, and wrought revolution in the southern states themselves, and inaugurated a new dispensation. Society here is like a broken loom, and the piece which rebellion put in, and was weaving, has been cut, and every thread broken. We must put in new warp and new woof, and weaving anew, as the fabric slowly unwinds we shall see in it no Gorgon figures, no hideous grotesques of the old barbarism, but the figures of vines, and golden grains, framing in the heads of justice, love, and liberty. The august convention of 1787 formed the Constitution with this memo-

rable preamble: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain this Constitution for the United States of America." Again, in the awful convention of war, the people of the United States, for the very ends just recited, have debated, settled, and ordained certain fundamental truths, which must henceforth be accepted and obeyed. Nor is any state nor any individual wise who shall disregard them. They are to civil affairs what the natural laws are to health—indispensable conditions of peace and happiness. What are the ordinances given by the people, speaking out of fire and darkness of war, with authority inspired by that same God who gave the law from Sinai amid thunders and trumpet voices? 1. That these United States shall be one and indivisible. 2. That states are not absolute sovereigns, and have no right to dismember the republic. 3. That universal liberty is indispensable to republican government, and that slavery shall be utterly and forever abolished.

Such are the results of war. These are the best fruits of the war. They are worth all they have cost. They are foundations of peace. They will secure benefits to all nations as well as to us. Our highest wisdom and duty is to accept the facts as the decrees of God. We are exhorted to forget all that has happened. Yes, the wrath, the conflict, the cruelty, but not those overruling decrees of God which this war has pronounced. As solemnly as on Mount Sinai, God says, "Remember! remember!" Hear it today. Under this sun, under that bright child of the sun, our banner, with the eyes of this nation and of the world upon us, we repeat the syllables of God's providence and recite the solemn decrees: No more disunion! No more secession! No more slavery! Why did this civil war begin? We do not wonder that European statesmen failed to comprehend this conflict, and that foreign philanthropists were shocked at a murderous war that seemed to have had no moral origin, but, like the brutal fights of beasts of prey, to have sprung from ferocious animalism. This great nation, filling all profitable latitudes, cradled between two

oceans, with inexhaustible resources, with riches increasing in an unparalleled ratio, by agriculture, by manufactures, by commerce, with schools and churches, with books and newspapers thick as leaves in our own forests, with institutions sprung from the people, and peculiarly adapted to their genius; a nation not sluggish, but active, used to excitement, practised in political wisdom, and accustomed to self-government, and all its vast outlying parts held together by a federal government, mild in temper, gentle in administration, and beneficent in results, seemed to have been formed for peace. All at once, in this hemisphere of happiness and hope, there came trooping clouds with fiery bolts, full of death and desolation. At a cannon shot upon this fort, all the nation, as if they had been a trained army lying on their arms, awaiting a signal, rose up and began a war which, for awfulness, rises into the front rank of bad eminence. The front of the battle, going with the sun, was twelve hundred miles long; and the depth, measured along a meridian, was a thousand miles. In this vast area more than two million men, first and last, for four years, have, in skirmish, fight, and battle, met in more than a thousand conflicts; while a coast and river line, not less than four thousand miles in length, has swarmed with fleets freighted with artillery. The very industry of the country seemed to have been touched by some infernal wand, and, with one wheel, changed its front from peace to war. The anvils of the land beat like drums. As out of the ooze emerge monsters, so from our mines and foundries uprose new and strange machines of war, ironclad. And thus, in a nation of peaceful habits, without external provocation, there arose such a storm of war as blackened the whole horizon and hemisphere. What wonder that foreign observers stood amazed at this fanatical fury, that seemed without Divine guidance, but inspired wholly with infernal frenzy. The explosion was sudden, but the train had long been laid. We must consider the condition of southern society if we would understand the mystery of this iniquity. Society in the South resolves itself into three divisions, more sharply distinguished than in any other part of the nation. At the base is the laboring class, made up of slaves. Next is the middle class, made up of traders, small

farmers, and poor men. The lower edge of this class touches the slave, and the upper edge reaches up to the third and ruling class. This class was a small minority in numbers, but in practical ability they had centred in their hands the whole government of the South, and had mainly governed the whole country. Upon this polished, cultured, exceedingly capable, and wholly unprincipled class, rests the whole burden of this war. Forced up by the bottom heat of slavery, the ruling class in all the disloyal states arrogated to themselves a superiority not compatible with republican equality, nor with just morals. They claimed a right of preeminence. An evil prophet arose who trained these wild and luxuriant shoots of ambition to the shapely form of a political philosophy. By its reagents they precipitated drudgery to the bottom of society, and left at the top what they thought to be a clarified fluid. In their political economy, labor was to be owned by capital; in their theory of government, the few were to rule the many. They boldly avowed, not alone the fact, that, under all forms of government, the few rule the many, but their right and duty to do so. Set free from the necessity of labor, they conceived a contempt for those who felt its wholesome regimen. Believing themselves foreordained to supremacy, they regarded the popular vote, when it failed to register their wishes, as an intrusion and a nuisance. They were born in a garden, and popular liberty, like freshets overswelling their banks, but covered their dainty walks and flowers with slime and mud—of democratic votes. When, with shrewd observation, they saw the growth of the popular element in the northern states, they instinctively took in the inevitable events. It must be controlled, or cut off from a nation governed by gentlemen! Controlled, less and less, could it be in every decade; and they prepared secretly, earnestly, and with wide conference and mutual connivance, to effect the separation. We are to distinguish between the pretenses and means, and the real causes of this war. To inflame and unite the great middle class of the South, who had no interest in separation and no business with war, they alleged grievances that never existed, and employed arguments which they, better than all other men, knew to be specious and false.

Slavery itself was cared for only as an instrument of power or of excitement. They had unalterably fixed their eye upon empire, and all was good which would secure that, and bad which hindered it. Thus, the ruling class of the South—an aristocracy as intense, proud, and inflexible as ever existed—not limited either by customs or institutions, not recognized and adjusted in the regular order of society, playing a reciprocal part in its machinery, but secretly disowning its own existence, baptized with ostentatious names of democracy, obsequious to the people for the sake of governing them; this nameless, lurking aristocracy, that ran in the blood of society like a rash not yet come to the skin; this political parasite, that produced nothing, but lay coiled in the body, feeding on its nutriment, and holding the whole structure but a servant set up to nourish it—this aristocracy of the plantation, with firm and deliberate resolve, brought on the war, that they might cut the land in two, and, clearing themselves from an incorrigibly free society, set up a sterner, statelier empire, where slaves should work that gentlemen might live at ease. Nor can there be any doubt that though, at first, they meant to erect the form of republican government, this was but a device, a step necessary to the securing of that power by which they should be able to change the whole economy of society. That they never dreamed of such a war, we may well believe. That they would have accepted it, though twice as bloody, if only thus they could rule, none can doubt that knows the temper of these worst men of modern society. But they miscalculated. They understood the people of the South; but they were totally incapable of understanding the character of the great working classes of the loyal states. That industry, which is the foundation of independence, and so of equity, they stigmatized as stupid drudgery, or as mean avarice. That general intelligence and independence of thought which schools for the common people and newspapers breed, they reviled as the incitement of unsettled zeal, running easily into fanaticism. They more thoroughly misunderstood the profound sentiment of loyalty, the deep love of country, which pervaded the common people. If those who knew them best had never suspected the depth and power of that love of country which

threw it into an agony of grief when the flag was here humbled, how should they conceive of it who were wholly disjoined from the people in sympathy? The whole land rose up, you remember, when the flag came down, as if inspired unconsciously by the breath of the Almighty and the power of omnipotence. It was as when one pierces the banks of the Mississippi for a rivulet, and the whole raging stream plunges through with headlong course. There they calculated, and miscalculated! And more than all, they miscalculated the bravery of men who had been trained under law, who are civilized and hate personal brawls, who are so protected by society as to have dismissed all thought of self-defense, the whole force of whose life is turned to peaceful pursuits. These arrogant conspirators against government, with Chinese vanity, believed that they could blow away these self-respecting citizens as chaff from the battle-field. Few of them are left alive to ponder their mistake! Here, then, are the roots of this civil war. It was not a quarrel of wild beasts, it was an inflection of the strife of ages, between power and right, between ambition and equity. An armed band of pestilent conspirators sought the nation's life. Her children rose up and fought at every door and room and hall, to thrust out the murderers and save the house and household. It was not legitimately a war between the common peoples of the North and South. The war was set on by the ruling class, the aristocratic conspirators of the South. They suborned the common people with lies, with sophistries, with cruel deceits and slanders, to fight for secret objects which they abhorred, and against interests as dear to them as their own lives. I charge the whole guilt of this war upon the ambitious, educated, plotting, political leaders of the South. They have shed this ocean of blood. They have desolated the South. They have poured poverty through all her towns and cities. They have bewildered the imagination of the people with phantasms, and led them to believe that they were fighting for their homes and liberty, whose homes were unthreatened, and whose liberty was in no jeopardy. These arrogant instigators of civil war have renewed the plagues of Egypt, not that the oppressed might go free, but that the free might be oppressed. A day will come

when God will reveal judgment, and arraign at His bar these mighty miscreants; and then, every orphan that their bloody game has made, and every widow that sits sorrowing, and every maimed and wounded sufferer, and every bereaved heart in all the wide regions of this land, will rise up and come before the Lord to lay upon these chief culprits of modern history their awful testimony. And from a thousand battle-fields shall rise up armies of airy witnesses, who, with the memory of their awful sufferings, shall confront these miscreants with shrieks of fierce accusation; and every pale and starved prisoner shall raise his skinny hand in judgment. Blood shall call out for vengeance, and tears shall plead for justice, and grief shall silently beckon, and love, heart-smitten, shall wail for justice. Good men and angels will cry out: "How long, O Lord, how long, wilt thou not avenge?" And then these guiltiest and most remorseless traitors, these high and cultured men—with might and wisdom, used for the destruction of their country—these most accursed and detested of all criminals, that have drenched a continent in needless blood, and moved the foundations of their times with hideous crimes and cruelty, caught up in black clouds, full of voices of vengeance and lurid with punishment, shall be whirled aloft and plunged downward forever and forever in an endless retribution; while God shall say, "Thus shall it be to all who betray their country"; and all in heaven and upon the earth will say "Amen!"

But for the people misled, for the multitudes drafted and driven into this civil war, let not a trace of animosity remain. The moment the willing hand drops the musket, and they return to their allegiance, then stretch out your own honest right hand to greet them. Recall to them the old days of kindness. Our hearts wait for their redemption. All the resources of a renovated nation shall be applied to rebuild their prosperity, and smooth down the furrows of war. Has this long and weary period of strife been an unmingled evil? Has nothing been gained? Yes, much. This nation has attained to its manhood. Among Indian customs is one which admits young men to the rank of warriors only after severe trials of hunger, fatigue, pain, endurance. They reach their station, not through years,

but ordeals. Our nation has suffered, but now is strong. The sentiment of loyalty and patriotism, next in importance to religion, has been rooted and grounded. We have something to be proud of, and pride helps love. Never so much as now did we love our country. But four such years of education in ideas, in the knowledge of political truth, in the lore of history, in the geography of our own country, almost every inch of which we have probed with the bayonet, have never passed before. There is half a hundred years advance in four. We believed in our institutions and principles before; but now we know their power. It is one thing to look upon artillery, and be sure that it is loaded; it is another thing to prove its power in battle! We believed in the hidden power stored in our institutions; we had never before seen this nation thundering like Mount Sinai at all those that worshiped the calf at the base of the mountain. A people educated and moral are competent to all the exigencies of national life. A vote can govern better than a crown. We have proved it. A people intelligent and religious are strong in all economic elements. They are fitted for peace and competent to war. They are not easily inflamed, and, when justly incensed, not easily extinguished. They are patient in adversity, endure cheerfully needful burdens, tax themselves for real wants more royally than any prince would dare to tax his people. They pour forth without stint relief for the sufferings of war, and raise charity out of the realm of a dole into a munificent duty of beneficence. The habit of industry among free men prepares them to meet the exhaustion of war with increase of productiveness commensurate with the need that exists. Their habits of skill enable them at once to supply such armies as only freedom can muster, with arms and munitions such as only free industry can create. Free society is terrible in war, and afterward repairs the mischief of war with celerity almost as great as that with which the ocean heals the seams gashed in it by the keel of a plowing ship. Free society is fruitful of military genius. It comes when called; when no longer needed, it falls back as waves do to the level of the common sea, that no wave may be greater than the undivided water. With proof of strength so great, yet in its infancy, we stand up among

the nations of the world, asking no privileges, asserting no rights, but quietly assuming our place, and determined to be second to none in the race of civilization and religion. Of all nations we are the most dangerous and the least to be feared. We need not expound the perils that wait upon enemies that assault us. They are sufficiently understood. But it is not because we are warlike that we are a dangerous people. All the arrogant attitudes of this nation, so offensive formerly to foreign governments, were inspired by slavery, and under the administration of its minions. Our tastes, our habits, our interests, and our principles, incline us to the arts of peace. This nation was founded by the common people for the common people. We are seeking to embody in public economy more liberty, with higher justice and virtue, than have been organized before. By the necessity of our doctrines, we are put in sympathy with the masses of men in all nations. It is not our business to subdue nations, but to augment the powers of the common people. The vulgar ambition of mere domination, as it belongs to universal human nature, may tempt us; but it is withstood by the whole force of our principles, our habits, our precedents, and our legends. We acknowledge the obligation which our better political principles lay upon us, to set an example more temperate, humane, and just than monarchical governments can. We will not suffer wrong, and still less will we inflict it upon other nations. Nor are we concerned that so many, ignorant of our conflict, for the present misconceive the reasons of our invincible military zeal. "Why contend," say they, "for a little territory that you do not need?" Because it is ours. Because it is the interest of every citizen to save it from becoming a fortress and refuge of iniquity. This nation is our house, and our fathers' house; and accursed be the man who will not defend it to the uttermost. More territory than we need! England, that is not large enough to be our pocket, may think that it is more than we need; but we are better judges of what we need than others are.

Shall a philanthropist say to a banker, who defends himself against a robber, "Why do you need so much money?" But we will not reason with such questions. When any foreign nation willingly will divide its territory and give it

cheerfully away, we will answer the question why we are fighting for territory.

I now pass to the consideration of benefits that accrue to the South in distinction from the rest of the nation. At present the South reaps only suffering; but good seed lies buried under the furrows of war, that peace will bring to harvest. 1. Deadly doctrines have been purged away in blood. The subtle poison of secession was a perpetual threat of revolution. The sword has ended that danger. That which reason had affirmed as a philosophy, that people have settled as a fact. Theory pronounces: "There can be no permanent government where each integral particle has liberty to fly off." Who would venture upon a voyage in a ship, each plank and timber of which might withdraw at its pleasure? But the people have reasoned by the logic of the sword and of the ballot, and they have declared that states are inseparable parts of the national government. They are not sovereign. State rights remain; but sovereignty is a right higher than all others; and that has been made into a common stock for the benefit of all. All further agitation is ended. This element must be cast out of our political problems. Henceforth that poison will not rankle in the blood. 2. Another thing has been learned: the rights and duties of minorities. The people of the whole nation are of more authority than the people of any section. These United States are supreme over northern, eastern, western, and southern states. It ought not to have required the awful chastisement of war to teach that a minority must submit the control of the nation's government to a majority. The army and the navy have been good political schoolmasters. The lesson is learned. Not for many generations will it require further illustration. 3. No other lesson will be more fruitful of peace than the dispersion of those conceits of vanity, which, on either side, have clouded the recognition of the manly courage of all Americans. If it be a sign of manhood to be able to fight, then Americans are men. The North certainly is in no doubt whatever of the soldierly qualities of southern men. Southern soldiers have learned that all latitudes breed courage on this continent. Courage is a passport to respect. The people of all the regions of this nation are likely here-

after to cherish a generous admiration of each other's prowess. The war has bred respect, and respect will breed affection, and affection peace and unity. 4. No other event of the war can fill an intelligent southern man, of candid nature, with more surprise than the revelation of the capacity, moral and military, of the black race. It is a revelation indeed. No people were ever less understood by those most familiar with them. They were said to be lazy, lying, impudent, and cowardly wretches, driven by the whip alone to the tasks needful to their own support and the functions of civilization. They were said to be dangerous, bloodthirsty, liable to insurrection; but four years of tumultuous distress and war have rolled across the area inhabited by them, and I have yet to hear of one authentic instance of the misconduct of a colored man. They have been patient and gentle and docile in the land while the men of the South were away in the army; they have been full of faith and hope and piety; and, when summoned to freedom, they have emerged with all the signs and tokens that freedom will be to them what it was to be, the swaddling-band that shall bring them to manhood. And after the government, honoring them as men, summoned them to the field, when once they were disciplined, and had learned the art of war, they proved themselves to be not second to their white brethren in arms. And when the roll of men that have shed their blood is called in the other land, many and many a dusky face will rise, dark no more when the light of eternal glory shall shine upon it from the throne of God! 5. The industry of the southern states is regenerated, and now rests upon a basis that never fails to bring prosperity. Just now industry is collapsed; but it is not dead; it sleepeth. It is vital yet. It will spring like mown grass from the roots that need but showers and heat and time to bring them forth. Though in many districts not a generation will see wanton wastes of self-invoked war repaired, and many portions may lapse again to wilderness, yet, in our lifetime, we shall see states, as a whole, raised to a prosperity vital, wholesome, and immovable. 6. The destruction of class interests, working with a religion which tends toward true democracy, in proportion as it is pure and free, will create a new era of prosperity for the common

laboring people of the South. Upon them have come the labor, the toil, and the loss of this war. They have fought blindfolded. They have fought for a class that sought their degradation, while they were made to believe that it was for their own homes and altars. Their leaders meant a supremacy which would not long have left them political liberty, save in name. But their leaders are swept away. The sword has been hungry for the ruling classes. It has sought them out with remorseless zeal. New men are to rise up; new ideas are to bud and blossom; and there will be men with different ambition and altered policy. 7. Meanwhile, the South, no longer a land of plantations, but of farms; no longer tilled by slaves, but by freedmen, will find no hindrance to the spread of education. Schools will multiply. Books and papers will spread. Churches will bless every hamlet. There is a good day coming for the South. Through darkness and tears and blood she has sought it. It has been an unconscious via dolorosa. But in the end it will be worth all that it has cost. Her institutions before were deadly. She nourished death in her bosom. The greater her secular prosperity, the more sure was her ruin. Every year of delay but made the change more terrible. Now, by an earthquake, the evil is shaken down. And her own historians, in a better day, shall write, that from the day the sword cut off the cancer, she began to find her health. What, then, shall hinder the rebuilding of this republic? The evil spirit is cast out: why should not this nation cease to wander among tombs, cutting itself? Why should it not come, clothed and in its right mind, to "sit at the feet of Jesus"? Is it feared that the government will oppress the conquered states? What possible motive has the government to narrow the base of that pyramid on which its own permanence stands? Is it feared that the rights of the states will be withheld? The South is not more jealous of their state rights than the North. State rights from the earliest colonial days have been the peculiar pride and jealousy of New England. In every stage of national formation, it was peculiarly northern, and not southern, statesmen that guarded state rights as we were forming the Constitution. But once united, the loyal states gave up forever that which had been delegated to

the national government. And now, in the hour of victory, the loyal states do not mean to trench upon southern state rights. They will not do it, nor suffer it to be done. There is not to be one rule for high latitudes and another for low. We take nothing from the southern states that has not already been taken from the northern. The South shall have just those rights that every eastern, every middle, every western state has—no more, no less. We are not seeking our own aggrandizement by impoverishing the South. Its prosperity is an indispensable element of our own.

We have shown, by all that we have suffered in war, how great is our estimate of the importance of the southern states of this Union; and we will measure that estimate, now, in peace, by still greater exertions for their rebuilding. Will reflecting men not perceive, then, the wisdom of accepting established facts, and, with alacrity of enterprise, begin to retrieve the past? Slavery cannot come back. It is the interest, therefore, of every man to hasten its end. Do you want more war? Are you not yet weary of contest? Will you gather up the unexploded fragments of this prodigious magazine of all mischief, and heap them up for continued explosions? Does not the South need peace? And, since free labor is inevitable, will you have it in its worst forms or in its best? Shall it be ignorant, impertinent, indolent, or shall it be educated, self-respecting, moral, and self-supporting? Will you have men as drudges, or will you have them as citizens? Since they have vindicated the government, and cemented its foundation stones with their blood, may they not offer the tribute of their support to maintain its laws and its policy? It is better for religion; it is better for political integrity; it is better for industry; it is better for money—if you will have that ground motive—that you should educate the black man, and, by education, make him a citizen. They who refuse education to the black man would turn the South into a vast poorhouse, and labor into a pendulum, incessantly vibrating between poverty and indolence. From this pulpit of broken stone we speak forth our earnest greeting to all our land. We offer to the President of these United States our solemn congratulations that God has sustained his life

and health under the unparalleled burdens and sufferings of four bloody years, and permitted him to behold this auspicious consummation of that national unity for which he has waited with so much patience and fortitude, and for which he has labored with such disinterested wisdom. To the members of the government associated with him in the administration of perilous affairs in critical times; to the senators and representatives of the United States, who have eagerly fashioned the instruments by which the popular will might express and enforce itself, we tender our grateful thanks. To the officers and men of the army and navy, who have so faithfully, skilfully, and gloriously upheld their country's authority, by suffering, labor, and sublime courage, we offer here a tribute beyond the compass of words. Upon those true and faithful citizens, men and women, who have borne up with unflinching hope in the darkest hour, and covered the land with the labors of love and charity, we invoke the divinest blessing of Him whom they have so truly imitated. But chiefly to Thee, God of our fathers, we render thanksgiving and praise for that wondrous providence that has brought forth from such a harvest of war the seed of so much liberty and peace. We invoke peace upon the North. Peace be to the West! Peace be upon the South! In the name of God we lift up our banner, and dedicate it to peace, union, and liberty, now and forevermore! Amen.

JUDAH PHILIP BENJAMIN

EDUCATION THE FOUNDATION-STONE OF REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT

[Judah Philip Benjamin, an Anglo-American jurist and a leading statesman of the Confederacy, was born a British subject in the West Indies in 1811. His parents settled in the United States and he went for a few years to Yale. He afterward took up the practice of law in New Orleans, and became prominent in the political affairs of the South. He was elected to the United States Senate as a Democrat, seceded with his state, became the Confederate Secretary of War, and finally Secretary of State. His influence over Jefferson Davis was always considerable. When the Civil War ended he took refuge in England, where he practiced law with great success, and wrote a work, "The Law of Sale," which is a recognized legal classic. He died in 1884. The address that follows, on the subject of popular education, was delivered before a gathering of the Free Schools in the city of New Orleans in 1845.]

ONE of the most eminent philosophers of modern times, who had made the science of government his peculiar study, after investigating what were the principles essential to every mode of government known to man, has announced the great result that virtue was the very foundation, the corner-stone of republican governments; that by virtue alone could republican institutions flourish and maintain their strength; that in its absence they would wither and perish. Therefore it was that the enlightenment of the people by an extended system of moral education, their instruction in all those great elemental truths which elevate the mind and purify the heart of man, which, in a word, render him capable of self-government, were objects of the most anxious solicitude of our ancestors; and the Father of his Country, in that farewell address which has become the manual of every American citizen, when bestowing the

last counsels of a heart glowing with the purest and most fervent love of country that ever warmed a patriot's breast, urged upon his countrymen the vital necessity of providing for the education of the people, in language which cannot be too often repeated: "It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric? Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

Recreant indeed should we prove to the duty we owe to our country, unworthy indeed should we be of the glorious heritage of our fathers, if the counsels of Washington fell disregarded on our ears.

But if that great man had so decided a conviction of the absolute necessity of diffusing intelligence amongst the people in his day, how unspeakably urgent has that necessity become in ours! In the first attempts then made to organize our institutions on republican principles, the most careful and guarded measures were adopted in order to confine the powers of the government to the hands of those whose virtue and intelligence best fitted them for the exercise of such exalted duties. The population of the country was sparse; the men then living had witnessed the revolution that secured our independence; its din was still ringing in their ears; they had purchased liberty with blood, and dearly did they cherish, and watchfully did they guard, the costly treasure; the noblest band of patriots that ever wielded sword or pen in freedom's holy cause were still amongst them, shining lights, guiding by their example and instructing by their counsels, to which eminent public services gave added weight. Now, alas! the latest survivor of that noble band has passed away. Their light has ceased to shine on our path. The population that then scarce reached three millions now numbers twenty; and the steady and irresistible march of public opinion, constantly operating in the infusion of a greater and still greater proportion

of the popular element into our institutions, has at length reached the point beyond which it can no farther go; and from the utmost limits of the frozen North to the sunny clime of Louisiana, from the shores washed by the stormy Atlantic to the extreme verge of the flowery prairies of the Far West, there scarce breathes an American citizen who is not, in the fullest and broadest acceptation of the word, one of the rulers of his country. Imagination shrinks from the contemplation of the mighty power for weal or for woe possessed by these vast masses of men. If swayed by impulse, passion, or prejudice to do wrong, no mind can conceive, no pen portray, the scenes of misery and desolation that must ensue. But if elevated and purified by the beneficent influence of our free public education, if taught from infancy the lessons of patriotism and devotion to their country's good, if so instructed as to be able to appreciate and to spurn the counsels of those who in every age have been ready to flatter man's worst passions and to pander to his most degraded appetites for purposes of self-aggrandizement—if, in a word, trained in the school and imbued with the principles of our Washington, the most extravagant visions of fancy must fall short of picturing the vivid colors of the future that is open before us. The page of history will furnish no parallel to our grandeur; and the great republic of the western world, extending the blessings of freedom in this hemisphere and acting by its example in the other, will reach the proudest pinnacle of power and of greatness to which human efforts can aspire. And for the attainment of this auspicious result, how simple yet how mighty the engine which alone is required!—a universal diffusion of intelligence amongst the people by a bounteous system of free public education.

It has been said by the enemies of popular government that its very theory is false—that it proceeds on the assumption that the greater number ought to govern; and the records of history, and the common experience of mankind, are appealed to in support of the fact that the intelligence and capacity required for government are confined to a small minority; that only a fraction of this minority are possessed of a leisure or inclination for the study and reflection which are indispensable for the mastery of the impor-

tant questions on which the prosperity and happiness of a country must depend; and that those men best qualified to be the leaders and guides of their countrymen in the administration of the government have the smallest chances of success for the suffrages of the people, by reason of the secluded habits engendered by application to the very studies required to qualify them for the proper discharge of public duties. Those who are attached to free institutions can furnish but one reply to these arguments: the premises on which they rest must be destroyed; the foundation of fact must be swept away, and the majority, nay, the whole mass of the people must be furnished with that degree of instruction which is required for enabling them to appreciate the advantages which flow from a judicious selection of their public servants, and to distinguish and reward that true merit which is always unobtrusive. Nor is this an utopian idea; if not easy of attainment, the object is at least practicable with the means that a kind Providence has supplied for us. The most sanguine advocates for public schools cannot, nor do they, pretend that each scholar is to become a politician or a statesman, any more than it would be practicable or desirable to make of each an astronomer or a chemist. But in the same manner as it would be useful to instruct all in the general outlines and striking facts of those sciences, it will not be found difficult to give to the youth of America such instruction in the general outlines and main principles of our government as would enable them to discriminate between the artful demagogue or the shallow pretender and the man whose true merit should inspire their confidence and respect. This alone would suffice for all purposes connected with the stability and prosperity of our country and its institutions; for not even the stanchest opponent of free government pretends that the mass of the people are swayed by improper motives, that their impulses are wrong, but only that their ignorance exposes them to be misled by the designing.

The same eminent philosopher to whom I have already alluded, Montesquieu, after establishing the principle that virtue is the mainspring of democracies, alludes to this very subject of the education of the people in free governments, and remarks that it is especially for the preservation of such

governments that education is indispensable. He defines what he means by virtue in the people, and declares it to be the love of our country and its laws; the love of country which requires a constant preference of public interest to that of the individual, and which, to use his own language, is peculiarly affected by republics. "In them," says he, "the government is confided to all the citizens. Now, government is like all other earthly things—to be preserved, it must be cherished. Who ever heard of a king that did not love monarchy, or a despot who detested absolute power? Everything, then, depends on establishing this love of country, and it is to this end that education in republics ought specially to be directed." If this distinguished writer be correct in these remarks—and who can gainsay them?—how boundless the field for instruction and meditation which they afford! How is a love of country—that love of country on which our existence as a nation depends—to be preserved, cherished, and made within us a living principle, guiding and directing our actions? Love of country is not a mere brute instinct, binding us by a blind and unreflecting attachment to the soil, to the earth and rocks and streams that surrounded us at our birth. It is the offspring of early associations, springing up at the period when the infant perceptions are first awakened by the Creator to the beauteous works of His power which surround us, sustained and cherished by the memory of all the warm affections that glow in the morning of life. The reminiscences of our childish joys and cares, of the ties of family and of home, all rush back on the mind in maturer years with irresistible force, and cling to us even in our dying hour. England's noble bard never clothed a more beautiful thought in more poetic language than when he depicted the images that crowded into the memory of the gladiator dying in the arena of Rome:—

> "He recked not of the life he lost, nor prize—
> But where his rude hut by the Danube lay;
> There were his young barbarians all at play,
> There was their Dacian mother."

But although these feelings are natural to man in all climes and ages, how intensely are they felt, how deeply do

they become rooted in the hearts of those who, in addition to the early associations peculiar to each, are knit together in one common bond of brotherhood by the recollection of the great and noble deeds of those who have lived before them in the land; who can point to records of historic lore and show names of their country and her sons inscribed upon the brightest pages in the annals of the past! What, then, are the means by which to kindle this love of country into a steady and enduring flame, chaste, pure, and unquenchable as that which vestals for their goddess guarded? Your Free Public Schools. Let the young girl of America be instructed in the history of her country; let her be taught the story of the wives and mothers of the Revolution; of their devoted attachment to their country in the hour of its darkest peril; of that proud spirit of resistance to its oppressors which no persecution could overcome; of that unfaltering courage which lifted them high above the weakness of their sex, and lent them strength to encourage and to cheer the fainting spirits of those who were doing battle in its cause—and when that girl shall become a matron, that love of country will have grown with her growth and become strengthened in her heart, and the first lessons that a mother's love will instil into the breast of the infant on her knee will be devotion to that country of which her education shall have taught her to be justly proud. Take the young boy of America and lead his mind back to the days of Washington. Teach him the story of the great man's life. Follow him from the moment when the youthful soldier first drew his sword in defense of his country, and depict his conduct and his courage on the dark battle-field where Braddock fell. Let each successive scene of the desperate revolutionary struggle be made familiar to his mind; let him trace the wintry march by the blood-stained path of a barefooted soldiery winding their painful way over a frozen soil; teach him in imagination to share the triumphs of Trenton, of Princeton, and of Yorktown. Let him contemplate the hero, the patriot, and the sage, when the battle's strife was over and the victory secured, calmly surrendering to his country's rulers the rank and station with which they had invested him, withdrawing to the retirement of the home that he loved, and

modestly seeking to escape the honors that a grateful people were to bestow. Teach him to appreciate the less brilliant but more useful and solid triumphs of the statesman; tell him how, at the people's call, the man that was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," abandoned the calm seclusion that he cherished, again, at an advanced age, to expose himself to the stormy ocean of public life: first, to give aid and counsel to his countrymen in devising a frame of government that should forever secure their liberties; and then, by his administration of that government, to furnish a model and guide for the chief magistrates that were to succeed him. And then lead him at length to the last sad scene, the closing hour of the career of the greatest man that earth has ever borne, to the deathbed of the purest patriot that ever periled life in his country's cause, and let him witness a mighty people bowed down with sorrow and mourning the bereavement of their friend, their father. And as the story shall proceed, that boy's cheeks shall glow and his eye shall kindle with a noble enthusiasm, his heart shall beat with quicker pulse, and in his inmost soul shall he vow undying devotion to that country which, above all riches, possesses that priceless treasure, the name, the fame, and the memory of Washington.

Nor is it here that the glorious results of your system of universal education for the people are to be arrested. The same wise Providence which has bestowed on the inhabitant of the New World that restless activity and enterprise which so peculiarly adapt him for extending man's physical domain over the boundless forests that still invite the ax of the pioneer, has also implanted in his breast a mind searching, inquisitive, and acute; a mind that is yet destined to invade the domain of science, and to take possession of her proudest citadels. Hitherto the absence of some basis of primary instruction has caused that mind, in a great degree, to run riot, for want of proper direction to its energies; but its very excesses serve but to prove its native strength, as a noxious vegetation proves, by the rankness of its growth, the fertility of the soil when yet unsubdued by man. Let this basis be supplied, and instead of indulging in visionary schemes or submitting to the influ-

ence of the wildest fanaticism—instead of becoming the votary of a Mormon or a Miller—the freeman of America will seek other and nobler themes for the exercise of his intellect; other and purer fountains will furnish the living waters at which to slake his thirst for knowledge. The boundless field of the arts and sciences will be opened to his view. Emulation will lend strength and energy to each rival in the race of fame. Then shall we have achieved the peaceful conquest of our second, our moral independence. Then shall we cease morally as well as physically to be the tributaries of the old world. Then, in painting, other Wests and other Allstons will arise; then sculpture will boast of other Greenoughs and Powerses; then the name of Bowditch will not stand alone amongst the votaries of that science which has her home in the heavens; then other philosophers will take their place by the side of Franklin, and other divines will emulate the fame and follow in the footsteps of Channing.

THOMAS HART BENTON

THE POLITICAL CAREER OF ANDREW JACKSON

[Thomas Hart Benton, an American statesman, was born in North Carolina in 1782. At first a lawyer in Tennessee, he served under Jackson in the War of 1812, and then settled in Missouri. Political affairs attracted him at once; he was elected to the Senate from Missouri and retained his seat for thirty years, figuring prominently in nearly every leading debate in Washington during the period prior to the Civil War. He opposed the states' rights extremists, urged the opening up of the great West, and did his best to counteract the influence of Calhoun. He wrote a book entitled "Thirty Years' View," a record of his experience during his long term of congressional life. He died in 1858. The following speech was made in the Senate, 1834.]

THE expunging resolution and preamble having been read, Mr. Benton said: Mr. President, it is now near three years since the resolve was adopted by the Senate, which it is my present motion to expunge from the journal. At the moment that this resolve was adopted, I gave notice of my intention to move to expunge it, and then expressed my confident belief that the motion would eventually prevail. That expression of confidence was not an ebullition of vanity, nor a presumptuous calculation, intended to accelerate the event it affected to foretell. It was not a vain boast nor an idle assumption, but was the result of a deep conviction of the injustice done President Jackson, and a thorough reliance upon the justice of the American people. I felt that the President had been wronged, and my heart told me that this wrong would be redressed. The event proves that I was not mistaken. The question of expunging this resolution has been carried to the people, and their decision has been had upon it. They decide in favor of the expunction; and their decision has been both made and manifested, and communicated to us in a great variety of ways. A great number of states have expressly

instructed their senators to vote for this expunction. A very great majority of the states have elected senators and representatives to Congress, upon the express ground of favoring this expurgation. The Bank of the United States, which took the initiative in the accusation against the President, and furnished the material and worked the machinery which was used against him, and which was then so powerful on this floor, has become more and more odious to the public mind, and musters now but a slender phalanx of friends in the two houses of Congress. The late presidential election furnishes additional evidence of public sentiment. The candidate who was the friend of President Jackson, the supporter of his administration, and the avowed advocate for the expunction, has received a large majority of the suffrages of the whole Union, and that after an express declaration of his sentiments on this precise point. The evidence of the public will exhibited in all these forms is too manifest to be mistaken, too explicit to require illustration, and too imperative to be disregarded. Omitting details and specific enumeration of proofs, I refer to our own files for the instructions to expunge—to the complexion of the two houses for the temper of the people—to the denationalized condition of the Bank of the United States for the fate of the imperious accuser—and to the issue of the presidential election for the answer of the Union. All these are pregnant proofs of the public will; and the last preeminently so, because both the question of the expunction and the form of the process were directly put in issue upon it. A representative of the people from the State of Kentucky formally interrogated a prominent candidate for the presidency on these points, and required from him a public answer, for the information of the public mind. The answer was given, and published, and read by all the voters before the election; and I deem it right to refer to that answer in this place, not only as evidence of the points put in issue, but also for the purpose of doing more ample justice to President Jackson, by incorporating into the legislative history of this case the high and honorable testimony in his favor of the eminent citizen who has just been exalted to the lofty honors of the American presidency:—

"Your last question seeks to know 'my' opinion as to the constitutional power of the Senate or House of Representatives to expunge or obliterate from the journals the proceedings of a previous session.

"You will, I am sure, be satisfied, upon further consideration, that there are but few questions of a political character less connected with the duties of the office of President of the United States, or that might not with equal propriety be put by an elector to a candidate for that station, than this. With the journals of neither house of Congress can he properly have anything to do. But as your question has doubtless been induced by the pendency of Colonel Benton's resolutions to expunge from the journals of the Senate certain other resolutions touching the official conduct of President Jackson, I prefer to say that I regard the passage of Colonel Benton's preamble and resolutions to be an act of justice to a faithful and greatly injured public servant, not only constitutional in itself but imperiously demanded by a proper respect for the well-known will of the people."

I do not propose, sir, to draw violent, unwarranted, or strained inferences. I do not assume to say that the question of this expunction was a leading or controlling point in the issue of this election. I do not assume to say or insinuate that every individual and every voter delivered his suffrage with reference to this question. Doubtless there were many exceptions. Still, the triumphant election of the candidate who had expressed himself in the terms just quoted, and who was, besides, the personal and political friend of President Jackson, and the avowed approver of his administration, must be admitted to a place among the proofs in this case, and ranked among the high concurring evidences of the public sentiment in favor of the motion which I make.

Assuming, then, that we have ascertained the will of the people on this great question, the inquiry presents itself, how far the expression of that will ought to be conclusive of our action here. I hold that it ought to be binding and obligatory upon us; and that, not only upon the principles of representative government, which require obedience to the known will of the people, but also in conformity to the principles upon which the proceeding against President Jackson was conducted, when the sentence against him was adopted. Then, everything was done with special reference to the will of the people. Their impulsion was assumed

to be the sole motive to action, and to them the ultimate verdict was expressly referred. The whole machinery of alarm and pressure, every engine of political and moneyed power, was put in motion and worked for many months, to excite the people against the President, and to stir up meetings, memorials, petitions, traveling committees, and distress deputations against him; and each symptom of popular discontent was hailed as an evidence of public will, and quoted here as proof that the people demanded the condemnation of the President. Not only legislative assemblies and memorials from large assemblies were then produced here as evidence of public opinion, but the petitions of boys under age, the remonstrances of a few signers, and the results of the most inconsiderable elections, were ostentatiously paraded and magnified as the evidence of the sovereign will of our constituents. Thus, sir, the public voice was everything, while that voice—partially obtained through political and pecuniary machinations—was adverse to the President. Then the popular will was the shrine at which all worshiped. Now, when that will is regularly, soberly, repeatedly, and almost universally expressed through the ballot-boxes, at the various elections, and turns out to be in favor of the President, certainly no one can disregard it, nor otherwise look at it than as the solemn verdict of the competent and ultimate tribunal, upon an issue fairly made up, fully argued, and duly submitted for decision. As such verdict I receive it. As the deliberate verdict of the sovereign people I bow to it. I am content. I do not mean to reopen the case, nor to recommence the argument. I leave that work to others, if any others choose to perform it. For myself, I am content; and, dispensing with further argument, I shall call for judgment, and ask to have execution done upon that unhappy journal, which the verdict of millions of freemen finds guilty of bearing on its face an untrue, illegal, and unconstitutional sentence of condemnation against the approved President of the republic.

But, while declining to reopen the argument of this question, and refusing to tread over again the ground already traversed, there is another and a different task to perform: one which the approaching termination of President Jackson's administration makes peculiarly proper at

this time, and which it is my privilege, and perhaps my duty, to execute, as being the suitable conclusion to the arduous contest in which we have been so long engaged. I allude to the general tenor of his administration, and to its effect, for good or for evil, upon the condition of his country. This is the proper time for such a view to be taken. The political existence of this great man now draws to a close. In little more than forty days he ceases to be a public character. In a few brief weeks he ceases to be an object of political hope to any, and should cease to be an object of political hate or envy to all. Whatever of motive the servile and time-serving might have found in his exalted station for raising the altar of adulation, and burning the incense of praise before him, that motive can no longer exist. The dispenser of the patronage of an empire—the chief of this great confederacy of states—is soon to be a private individual, stripped of all power to reward or to punish. His own thoughts, as he has shown us in the concluding paragraph of that message which is to be the last of its kind that we shall ever receive from him, are directed to that beloved retirement from which he was drawn by the voice of millions of freemen, and to which he now looks for that interval of repose which age and infirmities require. Under these circumstances he ceases to be a subject for the ebullition of the passions, and passes into a character for the contemplation of history. Historically, then, shall I view him; and, limiting this view to his civil administration, I demand where is there a chief magistrate of whom so much evil has been predicted, and from whom so much good has come? Never has any man entered upon the chief magistracy of a country under such appalling predictions of ruin and woe. Never has any one been so pursued with direful prognostications. Never has any one been so beset and impeded by a powerful combination of political and moneyed confederates. Never has any one in any country, where the administration of justice has risen above the knife or the bowstring, been so lawlessly and shamelessly tried and condemned by rivals and enemies, without hearing, without defense, without the forms of law or justice. History has been ransacked to find examples of tyrants sufficiently odious to illustrate him by comparison.

Language has been tortured to find epithets sufficiently strong to paint him in description. Imagination has been exhausted in her efforts to deck him with revolting and inhuman attributes. Tyrant, despot, usurper; destroyer of the liberties of his country; rash, ignorant, imbecile; endangering the public peace with all foreign nations; destroying domestic prosperity at home; ruining all industry, all commerce, all manufactories; annihilating confidence between man and man; delivering up the streets of populous cities to grass and weeds, and the wharves of commercial towns to the incumbrance of decaying vessels; depriving labor of all reward; depriving industry of all employment; destroying the currency; plunging an innocent and happy people from the summit of felicity to the depths of misery, want, and despair. Such is the faint outline, followed up by actual condemnation, of the appalling denunciations daily uttered against this one man, from the moment he became an object of political competition, down to the concluding moment of his political existence.

The sacred voice of inspiration has told us that there is a time for all things. There certainly has been a time for every evil that human nature admits of to be vaticinated of President Jackson's administration; equally certain the time has now come for all rational and well-disposed people to compare the predictions with the facts, and to ask themselves if these calamitous prognostications have been verified by events. Have we peace, or war, with foreign nations? Certainly we have peace—peace with all the world—peace with all its benign and felicitous and beneficent influences. Are we respected or despised abroad? Certainly the American name never was more honored throughout the four quarters of the globe than at this very moment. Do we hear of indignity or outrage in any quarter, of merchants robbed in foreign ports, of vessels searched on the high seas, of American citizens impressed into foreign service, of the national flag insulted anywhere? On the contrary, we see former wrongs repaired; no new ones inflicted. France pays twenty-five millions of francs for spoliations committed thirty years ago; Naples pays two millions one hundred thousand ducats for wrongs of the same date; Denmark pays six hundred and fifty thousand rix-dollars

for wrongs done a quarter of a century ago; Spain engages to pay twelve millions of reals velon for injuries of fifteen years' date; and Portugal, the last in the list of former aggressors, admits her liability, and only waits the adjustment of details to close her account by adequate indemnity. So far from war, insult, contempt, and spoliation from abroad, this denounced administration has been the season of peace and good-will, and the auspicious era of universal reparation. So far from suffering injury at the hands of foreign powers, our merchants have received indemnities for all former injuries. It has been the day of accounting, of settlement, and of retribution. The long list of arrearages, extending through four successive previous administrations, has been closed and settled up. The wrongs done to commerce for thirty years back, and under so many different Presidents, and indemnities withheld from all, have been repaired and paid over under the beneficent and glorious administration of President Jackson. But one single instance of outrage has occurred, and that at the extremities of the world, and by a piratical horde, amenable to no law but the law of force. The Malays of Sumatra committed a robbery and massacre upon an American vessel. Wretches! They did not then know that Jackson was President of the United States, and that no distance, no time, no idle ceremonial of treating with robbers and assassins, was to hold back the arm of justice. Commodore Downes went out. His cannon and his bayonets struck the outlaws in their den. They paid in terror and in blood for the outrage which was committed; and the great lesson was taught to these distant pirates—to our antipodes themselves—that not even the entire diameter of this globe could protect them, and that the name of American citizen, like that of Roman citizen in the great days of the republic and of the empire, was to be the inviolable passport of all that bore it throughout the whole extent of the habitable world.

At home the most gratifying picture presents itself to the view: the public debt paid off; taxes reduced one half; the completion of the public defenses systematically commenced; the compact with Georgia, uncomplied with since 1802, now carried into effect, and her soil ready to be freed, as her jurisdiction has been delivered, from the presence

and encumbrance of an Indian population. Mississippi and Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, and North Carolina, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Arkansas—in a word, all the states encumbered with an Indian population—have been relieved from that encumbrance; and the Indians themselves have been transferred to new and permanent homes, every way better adapted to the enjoyment of their existence, the preservation of their rights, and the improvement of their condition.

The currency is not ruined. On the contrary, seventy-five millions of specie in the country is a spectacle never seen before, and is the barrier of the people against the designs of any banks which may attempt to suspend payments and to force a dishonored paper currency upon the community. These seventy-five millions are the security of the people against the dangers of a depreciated and inconvertible paper money. Gold, after a disappearance of thirty years, is restored to our country. All Europe beholds with admiration the success of our efforts, in three years, to supply ourselves with the currency which our Constitution guarantees, and which the example of France and Holland shows to be so easily attainable, and of such incalculable value to industry, morals, economy, and solid wealth. The success of these efforts is styled, in the best London papers, not merely a reformation, but a revolution, in the currency—a revolution by which our America is now regaining from Europe the gold and silver which she has been sending to them for thirty years past.

Domestic industry is not paralyzed; confidence is not destroyed; factories are not stopped; workmen are not mendicants for bread and employment; credit is not extinguished; prices have not sunk; grass is not growing in the streets of populous cities; the wharves are not lumbered with decaying vessels; columns of curses, rising from the bosoms of a ruined and agonized people, are not ascending to heaven against the destroyer of a nation's felicity and prosperity. On the contrary, the reverse of all this is true, and true to a degree that astonishes and bewilders the senses. I know that all is not gold that glitters, that there is a difference between a specious and a solid prosperity. I know that a part of the present prosperity is apparent

only, the effect of an increase of fifty millions of paper money forced into circulation by one thousand banks; but, after making due allowance for this fictitious and delusive excess, the real prosperity of the country is still unprecedentedly and transcendently great. I know that every flow must be followed by its ebb, that every expansion must be followed by its contraction. I know that a revulsion in the paper system is inevitable; but I know, also, that these seventy-five millions of gold and silver are the bulwark of the country, and will enable every honest bank to meet its liabilities, and every prudent citizen to take care of himself.

Turning to some points in the civil administration of President Jackson, and how much do we not find to admire! The great cause of the Constitution has been vindicated from an imputation of more than forty years' duration. He has demonstrated, by the fact itself, that a national bank is not "necessary" to the fiscal operations of the Federal government, and in that demonstration he has upset the argument of General Hamilton, and the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, and all that ever has been said in favor of the constitutionality of a national bank. All this argument and decision rested upon the single assumption of the "necessity" of that institution to the Federal government. He has shown it is not "necessary"; that the currency of the Constitution, and especially a gold currency, is all that the Federal government wants, and that she can get that whenever she pleases. In this single act he has vindicated the Constitution from an unjust imputation, and knocked from under the decision of the Supreme Court the assumed fact on which it rested. He has prepared the way for the reversal of that decision; and it is a question for lawyers to answer, whether the case is not ripe for the application of that writ of most remedial nature, as Lord Cole calls it, and which was invented lest in any case there should be an oppressive defect of justice —the venerable writ of audita querela defendentis—to ascertain the truth of a fact happening since the judgment, and upon the due finding of which the judgment will be vacated. Let the lawyers bring their books, and answer us if there is not a case here presented for the application of that ancient and most remedial writ.

From President Jackson the country has first learned the true theory and practical intent of the Constitution, in giving to the executive a qualified negative on the legislative power of Congress. Far from being an odious, dangerous, or kingly prerogative, this power, as vested in the President, is nothing but a qualified copy of the famous veto power vested in the tribunes of the people among the Romans, and intended to suspend the passage of a law until the people themselves should have time to consider it. The qualified veto of the President destroys nothing; it only delays the passage of a law, and refers it to the people for their consideration and decision. It is the reference of the law, not to a committee of the House, or of the whole House, but to the committee of the whole Union. It is a recommitment of the bill to the people, for them to examine and consider; and if, upon this examination, they are content to pass it, it will pass at the next session. The delay of a few months is the only effect of a veto in a case where the people shall ultimately approve a law; where they do not approve it, the interposition of the veto is the barrier which saves them the infliction of a law, the repeal of which might afterward be almost impossible. The qualified negative is, therefore, a beneficent power, intended, as General Hamilton expressly declares in the "Federalist," to protect, first, the executive department from the encroachments of the legislative department; and, secondly, to preserve the people from hasty, dangerous, or criminal legislation on the part of their representatives. This is the design and intention of the veto power; and the fear expressed by General Hamilton was, that Presidents, so far from exercising it too often, would not exercise it as often as the safety of the people required; they might lack the moral courage to stake themselves in opposition to a favorite measure of the majority of the two houses of Congress, and thus deprive the people, in many instances, of their right to pass upon a bill before it becomes a final law. The cases in which President Jackson has exercised the veto power has shown the soundness of these observations. No ordinary President would have staked himself against the Bank of the United States and the two houses of Congress in 1832. It required President Jackson to confront that

power, to stem that torrent, to stay the progress of that charter, and to refer it to the people for their decision. His moral courage was equal to the crisis. He arrested the charter until it could go to the people, and they have arrested it forever. Had he not done so, the charter would have become law, and its repeal almost impossible. The people of the whole Union would now have been in the condition of the people of Pennsylvania, bestrode by the monster, in daily conflict with him, and maintaining a doubtful contest for supremacy between the government of a state and the directory of a moneyed corporation.

To detail specific acts which adorn the administration of President Jackson, and illustrate the intuitive sagacity of his intellect, the firmness of his mind, his disregard of personal popularity, and his entire devotion to the public good, would be inconsistent with this rapid sketch, intended merely to present general views, and not to detail single actions, howsoever worthy they may be of a splendid page in the volume of history. But how can we pass over the great measure of the removal of the public moneys from the Bank of the United States in the autumn of 1833?—that wise, heroic, and masterly measure of prevention, which has rescued an empire from the fangs of a merciless, revengeful, greedy, insatiate, implacable, moneyed power. It is a remark for which I am indebted to the philosophic observation of my most esteemed colleague and friend [pointing to Dr. Linn], that, while it requires far greater talent to foresee an evil before it happens and to arrest it by precautionary measures, than it requires to apply an adequate remedy to the same evil after it has happened, yet the applause bestowed by the world is always greatest in the latter case. Of this the removal of the public moneys from the Bank of the United States is an eminent instance. The veto of 1832, which arrested the charter which Congress had granted, immediately received the applause and approbation of a majority of the Union; the removal of the deposits, which prevented the bank from forcing a recharter, was disapproved by a large majority of the country, and even of his own friends; yet the veto would have been unavailing, and the bank would inevitably have been rechartered, if the deposits had not been removed. The immense

sums of public money since accumulated would have enabled the bank, if she had retained the possession of it, to have coerced a recharter. Nothing but the removal could have prevented her from extorting a recharter from the sufferings and terrors of the people. If it had not been for that measure, the previous veto would have been unavailing; the bank would have been again installed in power and this entire Federal government would have been held as an appendage to that bank, and administered according to her directions and by her nominees. That great measure of prevention, the removal of the deposits, though feebly and faintly supported by friends at first, has expelled the bank from the field, and driven her into abeyance under a state charter. She is not dead, but, holding her capital and stockholders together under a state charter, she has taken a position to watch events and to profit by them. The royal tiger has gone into the jungle, and, crouching on his belly, he awaits the favorable moment for emerging from his cover and springing on the body of the unsuspicious traveler!

The treasury order for excluding paper money from the land offices is another wise measure, originating in an enlightened forecast and preventing great mischiefs. The President foresaw the evils of suffering a thousand streams of paper money, issuing from a thousand different banks, to discharge themselves on the national domain. He foresaw that, if these currents were allowed to run their course, the public lands would be swept away, the treasury would be filled with irredeemable paper, a vast number of banks must be broken by their folly, and the cry set up that nothing but a national bank could regulate the currency. He stopped the course of these streams of paper, and, in so doing, has saved the country from a great calamity, and excited anew the machinations of those whose schemes of gain and mischief have been disappointed, and who had counted on a new edition of panic and pressure, and again saluting Congress with the old story of confidence destroyed, currency ruined, prosperity annihilated, and distress produced, by the tyranny of one man. They began their lugubrious song; but ridicule and contempt have proved too strong for money and insolence, and the panic

letter of the ex-president of the denationalized bank, after limping about for a few days, has shrunk from the lash of public scorn, and disappeared from the forum of public debate.

The difficulty with France: what an instance it presents to the superior sagacity of President Jackson over all the commonplace politicians who beset and impede his administration at home! That difficulty, inflamed and aggravated by domestic faction, wore, at one time, a portentous aspect; the skill, firmness, elevation of purpose, and manly frankness of the President avoided the danger, accomplished the object, commanded the admiration of Europe, and retained the friendship of France. He conducted the delicate affair to a successful and mutually honorable issue. All is amicably and happily terminated, leaving not a wound, nor even a scar, behind; leaving the Frenchman and American on the ground on which they have stood for fifty years, and should forever stand—the ground of friendship, respect, good-will, and mutual wishes for the honor, happiness, and prosperity of each other.

But why this specification? So beneficent and so glorious has been the administration of this President that where to begin and where to end, in the enumeration of great measures, would be an embarrassment to him who has his eulogy to make. He came into office the first of generals; he goes out the first of statesmen. His civil competitors have shared the fate of his military opponents; and Washington city has been to the American politicians who have assailed him what New Orleans was to the British generals who attacked his lines. To be repulsed, driven back, discomfited, crushed, has been the fate of all assailants, foreign and domestic, civil and military. At home and abroad the impress of his genius and of his character is felt. He has impressed upon the age in which he lives the stamp of his arms, of his diplomacy, and of his domestic policy. In a word, so transcendent have been the merits of his administration that they have operated a miracle upon the minds of his most inveterate opponents. He has expunged their objections to military chieftains. He has shown them that they were mistaken; that military men were not the dangerous rulers they had imagined, but safe and prosper-

ous conductors of the vessel of state. He has changed their fear into love. With visible signs they admit their error, and, instead of deprecating, they now invoke the reign of chieftains. They labored hard to procure a military successor to the present incumbent; and if their love goes on increasing at the same rate, the republic may be put to the expense of periodical wars, to breed a perpetual succession of these chieftains to rule over them and their posterity forever.

To drop this irony, which the inconsistency of mad opponents has provoked, and to return to the plain delineations of historical painting, the mind instinctively dwells on the vast and unprecedented popularity of this President. Great is the influence, great the power, greater than any man ever before possessed in our America, which he has acquired over the public mind. And how has he acquired it? Not by the arts of intrigue or the juggling tricks of diplomacy; not by undermining rivals, or sacrificing public interests for the gratification of classes or individuals. But he has acquired it, first, by the exercise of an intuitive sagacity which, leaving all book-learning at an immeasurable distance behind, has always enabled him to adopt the right remedy at the right time, and to conquer soonest when the men of forms and office thought him most near to ruin and despair. Next, by a moral courage which knew no fear when the public good beckoned him to go on. Last and chiefest, he has acquired it by an open honesty of purpose which knew no concealments; by a straightforwardness of action which disdained the forms of office and the arts of intrigue; by a disinterestedness of motive which knew no selfish or sordid calculation; a devotedness of patriotism which staked everything personal on the issue of every measure which the public welfare required him to adopt. By these qualities and these means he has acquired his prodigious popularity and his transcendent influence over the public mind; and if there are any who envy that influence and popularity, let them envy also, and emulate, if they can, the qualities and means by which they were acquired.

Great has been the opposition to President Jackson's administration: greater, perhaps, than ever has been exhib-

ited against any government, short of actual insurrection and forcible resistance. Revolution has been proclaimed, and everything has been done that could be expected to produce revolution. The country has been alarmed, agitated, convulsed. From the Senate chamber to the village barroom, from one end of the continent to the other, denunciation, agitation, excitement has been the order of the day. For eight years the President of this republic has stood upon a volcano vomiting fire and flames upon him, and threatening the country itself with ruin and desolation, if the people did not expel the usurper, despot, and tyrant, as he was called, from the high place to which the suffrages of millions of freemen had elevated him.

Great is the confidence which he has always reposed in the discernment and equity of the American people. I have been accustomed to see him for many years, and under many discouraging trials, but never saw him doubt, for an instant, the ultimate support of the people. It was my privilege to see him often, and during the most gloomy period of the panic conspiracy, when the whole earth seemed to be in commotion against him, and when many friends were faltering, and stout hearts were quailing before the raging storm which bank machination and senatorial denunciation had conjured up to overwhelm him. I saw him in the darkest moments of this gloomy period; and never did I see his confidence in the ultimate support of his fellow citizens forsake him for an instant. He always said the people would stand by those who stand by them; and nobly have they justified that confidence! That verdict, the voice of millions, which now demands the expunction of that sentence which the Senate and the bank then pronounced upon him, is the magnificent response of the people's hearts to the implicit confidence which he then reposed in them. But it was not in the people only that he had confidence; there was another, and a far higher power, to which he constantly looked to save the country, and its defenders, from every danger; and signal events prove that he did not look to that high power in vain.

Sir, I think it right, in approaching the termination of this great question, to present this faint and rapid sketch of the brilliant, beneficent, and glorious administration of

President Jackson. It is not for me to attempt to do it justice; it is not for ordinary men to attempt its history. His military life, resplendent with dazzling events, will demand the pen of a nervous writer; his civil administration, replete with scenes which have called into action so many and such various passions of the human heart, and which has given to native sagacity so many victories over practised politicians, will require the profound, luminous, and philosophical conceptions of a Livy, a Plutarch, or a Sallust. This history is not to be written in our day. The contemporaries of such events are not the hands to describe them. Time must first do its office—must silence the passions, remove the actors, develop consequences, and canonize all that is sacred to honor, patriotism, and glory. In after ages the historic genius of our America shall produce the writers which the subject demands—men far removed from the contests of this day, who will know how to estimate this great epoch, and how to acquire an immortality for their own names by painting, with a master's hand, the immortal events of the patriot President's life.

And now, sir, I finish the task which, three years ago, I imposed on myself. Solitary and alone, and amidst the jeers and taunts of my opponents, I put this ball in motion. The people have taken it up and rolled it forward, and I am no longer anything but a unit in the vast mass which now propels it. In the name of that mass I speak. I demand the execution of the edict of the people; I demand the expunction of that sentence which the voice of a few senators, and the power of their confederate, the Bank of the United States, has caused to be placed on the journal of the Senate, and which the voice of millions of freemen has ordered to be expunged from it.

ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE

THE MARCH OF THE FLAG

[Albert J. Beveridge, an American political orator and member of the United States Senate, was born in Ohio in 1862. His boyhood was one of hardship, but he early resolved to acquire a good education, and saved money enough to take him through De Pauw University. To accomplish this he worked successively as teamster, laborer, farm-hand, and man of all work; but when his college days were over he became a lawyer's clerk, and at last a member of the bar. His ability soon asserted itself, and he had a good practice. Public affairs, however, had great interest for him, and this fact, combined with his unusual aptitude as a public speaker, made him in time very conspicuous in the Republican party in Indiana. In 1899 he was elected to the United States Senate, although he had never before held public office. One of his first steps was to visit the Philippine Islands to gather first-hand information, and as a result he became convinced of the duty of the United States to retain control of the archipelago. The following speech, relating to the holding of the Philippine Islands by the United States, was delivered at Indianapolis in 1898.]

FELLOW CITIZENS: It is a noble land that God has given us; a land that can feed and clothe the world; a land whose coast lines would enclose half the countries of Europe; a land set like a sentinel between the two imperial oceans of the globe, a greater England with a nobler destiny. It is a mighty people that He has planted on this soil; a people sprung from the most masterful blood of history; a people perpetually revitalized by the virile, man-producing working folk of all the earth; a people imperial by virtue of their power, by right of their institutions, by authority of their heaven-directed purposes—the propagandists and not the misers of liberty. It is a glorious history our God has bestowed upon His chosen people; a history whose keynote was struck by Liberty Bell; a history heroic with faith in our mission and our future; a history of states-

men who flung the boundaries of the republic out into unexplored lands and savage wildernesses; a history of soldiers who carried the flag across the blazing deserts and through the ranks of hostile mountains, even to the gates of sunset; a history of a multiplying people who overran a continent in half a century; a history of prophets who saw the consequences of evils inherited from the past, and of martyrs who died to save us from them; a history divinely logical, in the process of whose tremendous reasoning we find ourselves to-day.

Therefore, in this campaign, the question is larger than a party question. It is an American question. It is a world question. Shall the American people continue their resistless march toward the commercial supremacy of the world? Shall free institutions broaden their blessed reign as the children of liberty wax in strength, until the empire of our principles is established over the hearts of all mankind?

Have we no mission to perform, no duty to discharge to our fellow man? Has the Almighty Father endowed us with gifts beyond our deserts and marked us as the people of His peculiar favor, merely to rot in our own selfishness, as men and nations must who take cowardice for their companion and self for their deity—as China has, as India has, as Egypt has?

Shall we be as the man who had one talent and hid it, or as he who had ten talents and used them until they grew to riches? And shall we reap the reward that waits on our discharge of our high duty as the sovereign power of earth; shall we occupy new markets for what our farmers raise, new markets for what our factories make, new markets for what our merchants sell—aye, and, please God, new markets for what our ships shall carry?

Shall we avail ourselves of new sources of supply of what we do not raise or make, so that what are luxuries to-day will be necessities to-morrow? Shall our commerce be encouraged until, with Oceanica, the Orient, and the world, American trade shall be the imperial trade of the entire globe?

Shall we conduct the mightiest commerce of history with the best money known to man, or shall we use the

pauper money of Mexico, of China, and of the Chicago platform?

What are the great facts of this administration? Not a failure of revenue; not a perpetual battle between the executive and legislative departments of government; not a rescue from dishonor by European syndicates at the price of tens of millions in cash and national humiliation unspeakable. These have not marked the past two years—the past two years, which have blossomed into four splendid months of glory.

But a war has marked it, the most holy ever waged by one nation against another—a war for civilization, a war for a permanent peace, a war which, under God, although we knew it not, swung open to the republic the portals of the commerce of the world. And the first question you must answer with your vote is, whether you indorse that war? We are told that all citizens and every platform indorse the war, and I admit, with the joy of patriotism, that this is true. But that is only among ourselves, and we are of and to ourselves no longer. This election takes place on the stage of the world, with all earth's nations for our auditors. If the administration is defeated at the polls, will England believe that we accept the results of the war?

Will Germany, that sleepless searcher for new markets for her factories and fields, and therefore the effective meddler in all international complications—will Germany be discouraged from interfering with our settlement of the war, if the administration is defeated at the polls?

Will Russia, that weaver of the webs of commerce, into which province after province and people after people falls, regard us as a steadfast people if the administration is defeated at the polls?

The world is observing us to-day. Not a foreign office in Europe that is not studying the American republic and watching the American elections of 1898 as it never watched an American election before. Are the American people the chameleon of the nations? "If so, we can easily handle them," say the diplomats of the world.

Which result, say you, will have the best effect for us upon the great powers who watch us with the jealousy

strength always inspires—a defeat, at the hand of the American people, of the administration which has conducted our foreign war to a world-embracing success, and which has in hand the most important foreign problems since the Revolution; or such an indorsement of the administration by the American people as will swell to a national acclaim?

No matter what your views on the Dingley or the Wilson laws; no matter whether you favor Mexican money or the standard of this republic; we must deal from this day on with nations greedy of every market we are to invade; nations with statesmen trained in craft, nations with ships and guns and money and men. Will they sift out the motive for your vote, or will they consider the large result of the indorsement or rebuke of the administration? The world still rubs its eyes from its awakening to the resistless power and sure destiny of this republic. Which outcome of this election will be best for America's future—which will most healthfully impress every people of the globe with the steadfastness of character and tenacity of purpose of the American people—the triumph of the government at the polls, or the success of the opposition?

I repeat, it is more than a party question. It is an American question. It is an issue in which history sleeps. It is a situation which will influence the destiny of the republic.

And yet have we peace? Does not the cloud of war linger on the horizon? If it does not—if only the tremendous problems of peace now under solution remain, ought not the administration to be supported in its fateful work by the indorsement of the American people? Think of England abandoning its ministry at the moment it was securing the fruits of a successful war! Think of Germany rebuking Bismarck at the moment he was dictating peace to France! What would America say of them if they should do such a deed of mingled insanity, perfidy, and folly? What would the world say of America, if, in the very midst of peace negotiations upon which the nations are looking with jealousy, fear, and hatred, the American people should rebuke the administration in charge of those peace negotiations and place a hostile House and Senate in Washington? God

forbid! When a people show such inconstancy, such childish fickleness as that, their career as a power among nations is a memory.

But, if possible war lurks in the future, what then? Shall we forsake our leaders at the close of a campaign of glory and on the eve of new campaigns for which it has prepared? Yet that is what the success of the opposition to the government means. What is that old saying about the idiocy of him who changed horses while crossing a stream? It would be like discharging a workman because he was efficient and true. It would be like court-martialing Grant and discharging his heroes in dishonor because they took Vicksburg.

Ah! the heroes of Vicksburg and Peach Tree Creek, Atlanta, Mission Ridge, the Wilderness, and all those fields of glory, of suffering, and of death!

Soldiers of 1861! A generation has passed and you have reared a race of heroes worthy of your blood—heroes of El Caney, San Juan, and Cavité, of Santiago and Manila—aye! and 200,000 more as brave as they, who waited in camp with the agony of impatience the call of battle, ready to count the hellish hardship of the trenches the very sweets of fate, if they could only fight for the flag.

For every tented field was full of Hobsons, of Roosevelts, of Wheelers, and their men; full of the kind of soldiers that in regiments of rags, starving, with bare feet in the snows of winter, made Valley Forge immortal; full of the same kind of boys that endured the hideous hardships of the civil war, drank from filthy roadside pools as they marched through swamps of death, ate food alive with weevils, and even corn picked from the horses' camp, slept in the blankets of the blast with sheets of sleet for covering, breakfasted with danger and dined with death, and came back—those who did come back—with a laugh and a shout and a song of joy, true American soldiers, pride of their country, and envy of the world.

For that is the kind of boys the soldiers of 1898 are, notwithstanding the slanders of politicians and the infamy of a leprous press that try to make the world believe our soldiers are suckling babes and womanish weaklings, and our government, in war, a corrupt machine, fattening off

the suffering of our armies. In the name of the sturdy soldiery of America I denounce the hissing lies of politicians out of an issue, who are trying to disgrace American manhood in the eyes of the nations.

In the name of patriotism, I arraign these maligners of the soldierhood of our nation before the bar of the present and the past. I call to the witness stand that Bayard of our armies, General Joe Wheeler. I call that Hotspur of the South, Fitzhugh Lee. I call the 200,000 men themselves, who went to war for the business of war.

And I put all these against the vandals of politics who are blackening their fame as soldiers and as men. I call history to the witness stand. In the Mexican War the loss from every cause was 25 per cent., and this is on incomplete returns; in the present war the loss from every cause is only 3 per cent. In the Mexican War the sick lay naked on the ground with only blankets over them, and were buried with only a blanket around them. Of the volunteer force, 5,423 were discharged for disability, and 3,229 died from disease. When Scott marched to Mexico, only 96 men were left out of one regiment of 1,000. The average of a Mississippi company was reduced from ninety to thirty men. From Vera Cruz to Mexico a line of sick and dying marked his line of march.

General Taylor publicly declared that, in his army, five men died from sickness for every man killed in battle. Scott demanded surgeons. The government refused to give them. The three-months men lost nearly 9 per cent.; the six-months men lost 14 per cent.; the twelve-months men 29 per cent.; the men enlisted for the war lost 37 per cent.; 31,914 soldiers enlisted for the war, and 11,914 of these were lost, of whom 7,369 are unaccounted for.

In the war for the Union—no, there is no need of figures there. Go to the field of Gettysburg and ask. Go ask that old veteran how fever's fetid breath breathed on them and disease rotted their blood. And in the present war, thank God! the loss and suffering is less than in any war in all the history of the world.

And if any needless suffering there has been, if any deaths from criminal neglect, if any hard condition not a usual incident of sudden war by a peaceful people has been

permitted, William McKinley will see that the responsible ones are punished. Although our loss was less than the world ever knew before; although the condition of our troops was better than in any conflict of our history, McKinley the Just has appointed, from both parties, a commission of the most eminent men in the nation to lay the facts before him.

Let the investigation go on, and when the report is made the people of America will know how black as midnight is the sin of those who, for the purpose of politics, have shamed the hardihood of the American soldiers before the world, attempted to demoralize our army in the face of the enemy, and libeled the government at Washington to delighted and envious nations.

And think of what was done! Two hundred and fifty thousand men suddenly called to arms; men unused to the life of camps; men fresh from the soft comforts of the best homes of the richest people on earth. Those men, equipped, transported to camps convenient for instant call to battle; waiting there the command which any moment might have brought; supplies purchased in every quarter of the land and carried hundreds, even thousands of miles; uniforms procured, arms purchased, ammunition bought, citizens drilled into the finest soldiers on the globe; a war fought in the deadliest climate in the world, beneath a sun whose rays mean madness, and in Spanish surroundings—festering with fever—and yet the least suffering and the lowest loss ever known in all the chronicles of war.

What would have been the result if those who would have plunged us into war before we could have prepared at all could have had their way? What would have happened if these warriors of peace, who denounced the President as a traitor when he would not send the flower of our youth against Havana, with its steaming swamps of fever, its splendid outworks and its 150,000 desperate defenders—what would have happened if they could have had their way?

The mind shrinks and sickens at the thought. Those regiments, which we greeted the other day with our cheers of pride, would not have marched back again. All over this weeping land the tender song,

"We shall meet, but we shall miss him;
There will be one vacant chair,"

would have risen once again from desolated homes. And the men who would have done this are the men who are assailing the government at Washington to-day and blaspheming the reputation of the American soldier.

But the wrath of the people will pursue them. The scorpion whips of the furies will be as a caress to the deep damnation of those who seek a political issue in defaming the manhood of the republic. God bless the soldiers of 1898, children of the heroes of 1861, descendants of the heroes of 1776! In the halls of history they will stand side by side with those elder sons of glory, and the opposition to the government at Washington shall not deny them.

No! they shall not be robbed of the honor due them, nor shall the republic be robbed of what they won for their country. For William McKinley is continuing the policy that Jefferson began, Monroe continued, Seward advanced, Grant promoted, Harrison championed, and the growth of the republic has demanded. Hawaii is ours; Porto Rico is to be ours; at the prayer of the people Cuba will finally be ours; in the islands of the East, even to the gates of Asia, coaling stations are to be ours; at the very least the flag of a liberal government is to float over the Philippines, and I pray God it may be the banner that Taylor unfurled in Texas and Fremont carried to the coast—the stars and stripes of glory.

And the burning question of this campaign is, whether the American people will accept the gifts of events; whether they will rise as lifts their soaring destiny; whether they will proceed upon the lines of national development surveyed by the statesmen of our past; or whether, for the first time, the American people doubt their mission, question fate, prove apostate to the spirit of their race, and halt the ceaseless march of free institutions.

The opposition tells us that we ought not to govern a people without their consent. I answer: The rule of liberty, that all just government derives its authority from the consent of the governed, applies only to those who are capable of self-government. I answer: We govern the In-

dians without their consent, we govern our territories without their consent, we govern our children without their consent. I answer: How do you assume that our government would be without their consent? Would not the people of the Philippines prefer the just, humane, civilizing government of this republic to the savage, bloody rule of pillage and extortion from which we have rescued them?

Do not the blazing fires of joy and the ringing bells of gladness in Porto Rico prove the welcome of our flag?

And, regardless of this formula of words, made only for enlightened, self-governing peoples, do we owe no duty to the world? Shall we turn these people back to the reeking hands from which we have taken them? Shall we abandon them to their fate, with the wolves of conquest all about them—with Germany, Russia, France, even Japan, hungering for them? Shall we save them from those nations, to give them a self-rule of tragedy? It would be like giving a razor to a babe and telling it to shave itself. It would be like giving a typewriter to an Eskimo and telling him to publish one of the great dailies of the world. This proposition of the opposition makes the Declaration of Independence preposterous, as the reading of Job's lamentations would be at a wedding or an Altgeld speech on the Fourth of July.

They ask us how we will govern these new possessions. I answer: Out of local conditions and the necessities of the case methods of government will grow. If England can govern foreign lands, so can America. If Germany can govern foreign lands, so can America. If they can supervise protectorates, so can America. Why is it more difficult to administer Hawaii than New Mexico or California? Both had a savage and an alien population; both were more remote from the seat of government when they came under our dominion than Hawaii is to-day.

Will you say by your vote that American ability to govern has decayed; that a century's experience in self-rule has failed of a result? Will you affirm by your vote that you are an infidel to American vigor and power and practical sense? Or, that we are of the ruling race of the world; that ours is the blood of government; ours the heart of dominion; ours the brain and genius of administration?

ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE

Photogravure after a photograph from

Will you remember that we do but what our fathers did—we but pitch the tents of liberty farther westward, farther southward—we only continue the march of the flag.

The march of the flag!

In 1789 the flag of the republic waved over 4,000,000 souls in thirteen states, and their savage territory, which stretched to the Mississippi, to Canada, to the Floridas. The timid minds of that day said that no new territory was needed, and, for the hour, they were right. But Jefferson, through whose intellect the centuries marched; Jefferson, whose blood was Saxon, but whose schooling was French, and therefore whose deeds negatived his words; Jefferson, who dreamed of Cuba as a state of the Union; Jefferson, the first imperialist of the republic—Jefferson acquired that imperial territory which swept from the Mississippi to the mountains, from Texas to the British possessions, and the march of the flag began!

The infidels to the gospel of liberty raved, but the flag swept on! The title to that noble land out of which Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana have been carved was uncertain; Jefferson, strict constructionist of constitutional power though he was, obeyed the Anglo-Saxon impulse within him, whose watchword then and whose watchword throughout the world to-day is, "Forward," another empire was added to the republic, and the march of the flag went on!

Those who deny the power of free institutions to expand urged every argument, and more, that we hear to-day; but the people's judgment approved the command of their blood, and the march of the flag went on!

A screen of land from New Orleans to Florida shut us from the gulf, and over this and the Everglade peninsula waved the saffron flag of Spain. Andrew Jackson seized both, the American people stood at his back, and, under Monroe, the Floridas came under the dominion of the republic, and the march of the flag went on!

The Cassandras prophesied every prophecy of despair we hear to-day, but the march of the flag went on! Then Texas responded to the bugle-calls of liberty, and the march of the flag went on! And, at last, we waged war with Mexico, and the flag swept over the southwest, over

peerless California, past the Gate of Gold, to Oregon on the north, and from ocean to ocean its folds of glory blazed.

And now, obeying the same voice that Jefferson heard and obeyed, that Jackson heard and obeyed, that Monroe heard and obeyed, that Seward heard and obeyed, that Ulysses S. Grant heard and obeyed, that Benjamin Harrison heard and obeyed, William McKinley plants the flag over the islands of the seas, outposts of commerce, citadels of national security, and the march of the flag goes on! Bryan, Bailey, Bland, and Blackburn command it to stand still, but the march of the flag goes on! And the question you will answer at the polls is, whether you stand with this quartet of disbelief in the American people, or whether you are marching onward with the flag.

Distance and oceans are no arguments. The fact that all the territory our fathers bought and seized is contiguous, is no argument. In 1819 Florida was farther from New York than Porto Rico is from Chicago to-day; Texas, farther from Washington in 1845 than Hawaii is from Boston in 1898; California, more inaccessible in 1847 than the Philippines are now. Gibraltar is farther from London than Havana is from Washington; Melbourne is farther from Liverpool than Manila is from San Francisco. The ocean does not separate us from lands of our duty and desire—the oceans join us, a river never to be dredged, a canal never to be repaired.

Steam joins us; electricity joins us—the very elements are in league with our destiny. Cuba not contiguous! Porto Rico not contiguous! Hawaii and the Philippines not contiguous! Our navy will make them contiguous. Dewey and Sampson and Schley have made them contiguous, and American speed, American guns, American heart and brain and nerve will keep them contiguous forever.

But the opposition is right—there is a difference. We did not need the western Mississippi valley when we acquired it, nor Florida, nor Texas, nor California, nor the royal provinces of the far Northwest. We had no emigrants to people this imperial wilderness, no money to develop it, even no highways to cover it. No trade awaited us in its savage fastnesses. Our productions were not greater than

our trade. There was not one reason for the land-lust of our statesmen from Jefferson to Grant, other than the prophet and the Saxon within them.

But to-day we are raising more than we can consume. To-day we are making more than we can use. To-day our industrial society is congested; there are more workers than there is work; there is more capital than there is investment. We do not need more money—we need more circulation, more employment. Therefore we must find new markets for our produce, new occupation for our capital, new work for our labor. And so, while we did not need the territory taken during the past century at the time it was required, we do need what we have taken in 1898, and we need it now.

Think of the thousands of Americans who will pour into Hawaii and Porto Rico when the republic's laws cover those islands with justice and safety! Think of the tens of thousands of Americans who will invade mine and field and forest in the Philippines when a liberal government, protected and controlled by this republic, if not the government of the republic itself, shall establish order and equity there! Think of the hundreds of thousands of Americans who will build a soap-and-water, common-school civilization of energy and industry in Cuba, when a government of law replaces the double reign of anarchy and tyranny. Think of the prosperous millions that empress of islands will support when, obedient to the law of political gravitation, her people ask for the highest honor liberty can bestow, the sacred Order of the Stars and Stripes, the citizenship of the Great Republic!

What does all this mean for every one of us? It means opportunity for all the glorious young manhood of the republic—the most virile, ambitious, impatient, militant manhood the world has ever seen. It means that the resources and the commerce of these immensely rich dominions will be increased as much as American energy is greater than Spanish sloth; for Americans henceforth will monopolize those resources and that commerce.

In Cuba alone there are 15,000,000 acres of forest unacquainted with the ax. There are exhaustless mines of iron. There are priceless deposits of manganese, millions

of dollars of which we must buy to-day from the Black Sea districts. There are millions of acres yet unexplored.

The resources of Porto Rico have only been trifled with. The riches of the Philippines have hardly been touched by the finger-tips of modern methods. And they produce what we cannot, and they consume what we produce—the very predestination of reciprocity—a reciprocity "not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." They sell hemp, silk, sugar, cocoanuts, coffee, fruits of the tropics, timber of price like mahogany; they buy flour, clothing, tools, implements, machinery, and all that we can raise and make. And William McKinley intends that their trade shall be ours.

Do you indorse that policy with your vote? It means creative investment for every dollar of idle capital in the land—an opportunity for the rich man to do something with his money besides hoarding it or lending it. It means occupation for every workingman in the country at wages which the development of new resources, the launching of new enterprises, the monopoly of new markets always brings.

Cuba is as large as Pennsylvania, and is the richest spot on all the globe. Hawaii is as large as New Jersey; Porto Rico half as large as Hawaii; the Philippines larger than all New England, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware. All these are larger than the British Isles, larger than France, larger than Germany, larger than Japan. The trade of these islands, developed as we will develop it by developing their resources, monopolized as we will monopolize it, will set every reaper in this republic singing, every spindle whirling, every furnace spouting the flames of industry.

I ask each one of you this personal question: Do you believe that these resources will be better developed and that commerce best secured; do you believe that all these priceless advantages will be better availed of for the benefit of this republic by Bryan, Bailey, Bland, and Blackburn and the opposition; or by William McKinley and a House and Senate that will help and not hinder him?

Which do you think will get the most good for you and the American people out of the opportunities which Provi-

dence has given us—the government at Washington, or the opposition in Nebraska, Texas, Kentucky, and Missouri?

Which side will you belong to—those who pull forward in the traces of national prosperity and destiny, or those who pull back in those traces, balk at every step of advancement, and bray at every mile-post of progress?

If any man tells you that trade depends on cheapness and not on government influence, ask him why England does not abandon South Africa, Egypt, India. Why does France seize South China, Germany the vast region whose port is Kiouchou? Consider the commerce of the Spanish islands. In 1897 we bought of the Philippines $4,383,740, and we sold them only $94,597. Great Britain, that national expert in trade, did little better, for, in 1896, she bought $6,223,426 and sold only $2,063,598. But Spain—Spain, the paralytic of commerce—Spain bought only $4,818,344 and sold $4,973,589! Fellow citizens, from this day on that proportion of trade, increased and multiplied, must belong to the American republic. I repeat, increased and multiplied, for with American brains and energy, with American methods and American government, does any one here to-night doubt that American exports will exceed Spain's imports twenty times over? Does any one of you doubt that $100,000,000 of food and clothing and tools and implements and machinery will ultimately be shipped every year from the United States to that archipelago of tremendous possibilities? And will any one of you refuse to welcome that golden trade with your vote?

What lesson does Cuba teach? Cuba can raise no cereals —no wheat, no corn, no oats, no barley, and no rye. What we make and raise Cuba consumes, and what she makes and raises we consume; and this order of commerce is fixed forever by the unalterable decrees of nature. And she is at our doors, too—only an ocean river between us.

Yet in 1896 we bought $40,017,703 of her products, and we sold her only $7,193,173 of our products; while Spain bought only $4,257,360 and sold her $26,145,800—and that proportion existed before the insurrection. Fellow citizens, from this day on that order must be reversed and increased. Cuba's present population is only about 1,000,000; her proper population is about 10,000,000. Tens of millions of

acres of her soil are yet untouched by enterprise. If Spain sells Cuba $21,000,000 in 1891, and $26,000,000 in 1896, America will sell Cuba $200,000,000 in 1906. In 1896 we bought of Porto Rico $2,296,653, and sold her only $1,985,888, and yet Spain bought only $5,423,760, and sold her $7,328,880. William McKinley proposes that those figures shall be increased and reversed, and the question is, whether you will indorse him in that resolution of prosperity. The practical question for each one of us is, whether we had better leave the development of all this tremendous commerce to the administration which liberated these island continents, and now has the settlement of their government under way, or risk the future in the hands of those who oppose the government at Washington and the commercial supremacy of the republic.

How will all this help each one of us? Our trade with Porto Rico and Hawaii will be as free as between the states of the Union, while every other nation on earth must pay our tariff before they can compete with us. Until Cuba and the Philippines shall ask for annexation, our trade with them will, at the very least, be like the preferential trade of Canada with England—a trade which gives the republic the preference over the rest of the world—a trade which applies the principle of protection to colonial commerce, the principle which all the world employs to-day; the principle which England uses whenever she fears for a market, and which she has put into practise against us in Canada. That, and the excellence of our goods and products; that, and the convenience of traffic; that, and the kinship of interests and destiny, will give the monopoly of these markets to the American people.

And then—then, the factories and mills and shops will call again to their hearts of fire the workingmen of the republic, to receive once more the wages and eat once more the bread of prosperous times; then the farmer will find at his door, once more, the golden home market of those who work in factory and mill, and who want flour and meat and butter and eggs and garments of wool, and who have once more the money to pay for it all.

It means new employment and better wages for every laboring man in the Union. It means higher prices for

every bushel of wheat and corn, for every pound of butter and meat, for every item that the farmers of this republic produce. It means active, vigorous, constructive investment of every dollar of moldy and miserly capital in the land.

It means all this to-morrow, and all this forever, because it means not only the trade of the prize provinces, but the beginning of the commercial empire of the republic. And, amid these great events, will you march forward with the endless column of prosperity, or sit with Bryan, Bailey, Bland, and Blackburn on the rotten and crumbling rail fence of dead issues, and hoot at the procession as it passes by?

I said, the commercial empire of the republic. That is the greatest fact of the future. And that is why these islands involve considerations larger than their own commerce. The commercial supremacy of the republic means that this nation is to be the sovereign factor in the peace of the world.

For the conflicts of the future are to be conflicts of trade —struggles for markets—commercial wars for existence. And the golden rule of peace is impregnability of position and invincibility of preparation. So we see England, the greatest strategist of history, plant her flag and her cannon on Gibraltar, at Quebec, the Bermudas, Vancouver, everywhere, until, from every point of vantage, her royal banner flashes in the sun. So Hawaii furnishes us a naval base in the heart of the Pacific; the Ladrones another, a voyage farther into the region of sunset and commerce; Manila another, at the gates of Asia—Asia, to the trade of whose hundreds of millions American merchants, American manufacturers, American farmers, have as good a right as those of Germany or France or Russia or England; Asia, whose commerce with England alone amounts to billions of dollars every year; Asia, to whom Germany looks to take the surplus of her factories and foundries and mills; Asia, whose doors shall not be shut against American trade. Within two decades the bulk of oriental commerce will be ours—the richest commerce in the world. In the light of that golden future our chain of new-won stations rises like ocean sentinels from the night of waters—Porto Rico, a nobler

Gibraltar; the Isthmian canal, a greater Suez; Hawaii, the Ladrones, the Philippines, commanding the Pacific!

Ah! as our commerce spreads, the flag of liberty will circle the globe, and the highways of the ocean—carrying trade to all mankind—be guarded by the guns of the republic. And, as their thunders salute the flag, benighted peoples will know that the voice of liberty is speaking, at last, for them; that civilization is dawning, at last, for them—liberty and civilization, those children of Christ's gospel, who follow and never precede the preparing march of commerce.

It is the tide of God's great purposes made manifest in the instincts of our race, whose present phase is our personal profit, but whose far-off end is the redemption of the world and the Christianization of mankind. And he who throws himself before that current is like him who, with puny arm, tries to turn the Gulf Stream from its course, or stay, by idle incantations, the blessed processes of the sun.

Shall this future of the race be left with those who, under God, began this career of sacred duty and immortal glory; or shall we risk it to those who would scuttle the ship of progress, and build a dam in the current of destiny's large designs?

And now, on the threshold of our career as the first power of earth, is the time to permanently adjust our system of finance. The American people have the most tremendous tasks of history to perform. They have the mightiest commerce of the world to conduct. They cannot halt their imperial progress of wealth and power and glory and Christian civilization to unsettle their money system every time some ardent imagination sees a vision and dreams a dream. Think of Great Britain becoming the commercial monarch of the world, with her financial system periodically assailed! Think of Holland or Germany or France bearing their burdens and yet sending their flag to every sea, with their money at the mercy of politicians out of an issue!

Let us settle the whole financial question on principles so sound that a revolution cannot shake their firm foundations. And then, like men, and not like children, let us on

to our tasks—on to our mission and on to our destiny. We are speeding up the shining rails of an immortal history; yonder, in the rear, is the nightmare swamp of free silver. Why go back to it, like the victim of opium to his deadly pipe?

Why not accept the gifts of nature and events—events which have made the oceans our servants, the trade-winds our allies, and the stars in their courses our champions?

Nature, which has thrown the wealth of Klondike, the new-found gold of the Philippines, the unsuspected and exhaustless mines of Colorado and the Cape into the crucible of financial agitation, and thus dissolved the last excuse for war upon the gold standard of civilization—the excuse that the gold supply is insufficient and is failing.

Now, when new rivers of gold are pouring through the fields of business, the foundations of all silver-standard arguments are swept away. Why mumble the meaningless phrases of a tale that is told, when the golden future is before us, the world calls us, its wealth awaits us, and God's command is upon us?

Why stand in the fatal stupor of financial fallacies muttering old sophistries that time has exploded, when opportunity beckons you all over the world—in Cuba, Hawaii, the Philippines, on the waters of commerce, in every market of the Occident and the Orient, and in your factories and stores and fields, here in our own beloved country, holy America, land of God's promise and home of God's providence?

There are so many real things to be done—canals to be dug, railways to be laid, forests to be felled, cities to be builded, unviolated fields to be tilled, priceless markets to be won, ships to be launched, peoples to be saved, civilization to be proclaimed, and the flag of liberty flung to the eager air of every sea. Is this an hour to waste upon triflers with nature's laws? Is this a season to give our destiny over to word-mongers and prosperity wreckers? Is this a day to think of office-seekers, to be cajoled by the politician's smile, or seduced by the hand-shake of hypocrisy? No! No! my fellow citizens!

It is an hour to remember your duty to the home. It is a moment to realize the opportunities fate has opened to

this favored people and to you. It is a time to bethink you of the conquering march of the flag. It is a time to bethink you of your nation and its sovereignty of the seas. It is a time to remember that the God of our fathers is our God, and that the gifts and the duties He gave to them, enriched and multiplied, He renews to us, their children.

And so it is an hour for us to stand by the government at Washington, now confronting the enemy in diplomacy, as our loyal hearts on land and sea stood to their guns and stood by the flag when they faced the enemy in war. It is a time to strengthen and sustain that devoted man, servant of the people and of the most high God, who patiently, silently, safely is guiding the republic out into the ocean of world interests and possibilities infinite. It is a time to cheer the beloved President of God's chosen people, till the whole world is vocal with American loyalty to the American government.

Fellow Americans, we are God's chosen people. Yonder at Bunker Hill and Yorktown His providence was above us. At New Orleans and on ensanguined seas His hand sustained us. Abraham Lincoln was His minister, and His was the Altar of Freedom the boys in blue set on a hundred battle-fields. His power directed Dewey in the East, and delivered the Spanish fleet into our hands on the eve of Liberty's natal day, as He delivered the elder armada into the hands of our English sires two centuries ago. His great purposes are revealed in the progress of the flag, which surpasses the intentions of congresses and cabinets, and leads us like a holier pillar of cloud by day and pillar of fire by night into situations unforeseen by finite wisdom, and duties unexpected by the unprophetic heart of selfishness. The American people cannot use a dishonest medium of exchange; it is ours to set the world its example of right and honor. We cannot fly from our world duties; it is ours to execute the purpose of a fate that has driven us to be greater than our small intentions. We cannot retreat from any soil where Providence has unfurled our banner; it is ours to save that soil for liberty and civilization. For liberty and civilization and God's promise fulfilled, the flag must henceforth be the symbol and the sign to all mankind —the flag!—

"Flag of the free heart's hope and home,
By angel hands to valor given,
Thy stars have lit the welkin dome,
And all their hues were born in heaven!
Forever wave that standard sheet,
Where breathes the foe but falls before us,
With freedom's soil beneath our feet,
And freedom's banner streaming o'er us!"

OTTO VON BISMARCK

WAR AND ARMAMENTS IN EUROPE

[On April 1, 1815, Otto von Bismarck, the future molder of the German empire, was born at Schönhausen, in the province of Saxony. His early years gave little prevision of the future that awaited him. He went to school in Berlin, and thence to the University of Göttingen. In 1847 a decided change came over him when he went as deputy to the first United Diet of Prussia and became allied with the ultra-conservative party. In 1859 he was sent as ambassador to St. Petersburg, where he remained until William I. became king in January 1861, when he was transferred to Paris, as a preliminary to his appointment to the head of the ministry. To this position he succeeded September 23, 1862. The purpose to which he now addressed his most earnest efforts, and which he finally attained, was the unification of the German states, with Prussia at the head and Austria counted out. Bismarck retained office as chancellor through the brief reign of Frederick, and entered upon that of William II., but came into conflict with him over the question of the treatment of the laboring classes; and after the defeat of the government in the elections of February, 1890, he resigned and retired to his estate at Varzin. He returned for a brief period to public life as a member of the Reichstag, but he soon retired, and died at Friedrichsruhe, July 30, 1898. The eloquent and patriotic speech that follows was made in the German Reichstag in 1888, and embodies the national love for the Fatherland.]

IF I rise to speak to-day it is not to urge on your acceptance the measure the president has mentioned [the army appropriation]. I do not feel anxious about its adoption, and I do not believe that I can do anything to increase the majority by which it will be adopted—by which it is all-important at home and abroad that it should be adopted. Gentlemen of all parties have made up their minds how they will vote, and I have the fullest confidence in the German Reichstag that it will restore our armament to the height from which we reduced it in the period between 1867

and 1882; and this not with respect to the conditions of the moment, nor with regard to the apprehensions which may excite the stock exchanges and the mind of the public; but with a considerate regard for the general condition of Europe. In speaking, I will have more to say of this than of the immediate question.

I do not speak willingly, for under existing conditions a word unfortunately spoken may be ruinous, and the multiplication of words can do little to explain the situation, either to our own people or to foreigners. I speak unwillingly, but I fear that if I kept silent there would be an increase rather than a diminution of the expectations which have attached themselves to this debate, of unrest in the public mind, of the disposition to nervousness at home and abroad. The public might believe the question to be so difficult and critical that a minister for foreign affairs would not dare to touch upon it. I speak, therefore, but I can say truly that I speak with reluctance. I might limit myself to recalling expressions to which I gave utterance from this same place a year and a day ago. Little change has taken place in the situation since then. I chanced to-day on a clipping from the "Liberal Gazette," a paper which I believe stands nearer to my friend, Representative Richter, than it does to me. It pictures one difficult situation to elucidate another, but I can take only general notice of the main points there touched on, with the explanation that if the situation has since altered, it is for the better rather than for the worse.

We had then our chief apprehension because of a war which might come to us from France. Since then, one peace-loving president has retired from administration in France, and another peace-loving president has succeeded him. It is certainly a favorable symptom that in choosing its new chief executive France has not put its hand into Pandora's box, but that we have assurance of a continuation under President Carnot of the peaceful policy represented by President Grévy. We have, moreover, other changes in the French administration whose peaceful significance is even stronger than that of the change in the presidency—an event which involved other causes. Such members of the ministry as were disposed to subordinate the peace of France

and of Europe to their personal interests have been shoved out, and others, of whom we have not this to fear, have taken their places. I think I can state, also—and I do it with pleasure, because I do not wish to excite, but to calm, the public mind—that our relations with France are more peaceful, much less explosive, than a year ago.

The fears which have been excited during the year have been occasioned more by Russia than by France, or I may say that the occasion was rather the exchange of mutual threats, excitements, reproaches, and provocations which have taken place during the summer between the Russian and the French press. But I do not believe that the situation in Russia is materially different now from what it was a year ago. The "Liberal Gazette" has printed in display type what I said then: "Our friendship with Russia sustained no interruption during our war, and it is elevated above all doubt to-day. We expect neither assault nor attack nor unfriendliness from Russia." Perhaps this was printed in large letters to make it easier to attack it; perhaps, also, with the hope that I had reached a different conclusion in the meantime, and had become convinced that my confidence in the Russian policy of last year was erroneous. This is not the case. The grounds which gave occasion for it lie partly in the Russian press and partly in the mobilization of Russian troops. I cannot attach decided importance to the attitude of the press. They say that it means more in Russia than it does in France. I am of the contrary opinion. In France the press is a power which influences the conclusions of the administration. It is not such a power in Russia, nor can it be; but in both cases the press is only spots of printer's ink on paper, against which we have no war to wage. There can be no ground of provocation for us in it. Behind each article is only one man—the man who has guided the pen to send the article into the world. Even in a Russian paper, we may say in an independent Russian paper, secretly supported by French subsidies, the case is not altered. The pen which has written in such a paper an article hostile to Germany has no one behind it but the man whose hand held the pen, the man who in his cabinet produced the lucubration and the protector which every Russian newspaper is wont to have—that is to say,

the official more or less important in Russian party politics who gives such a paper his protection. But both of them do not weigh a feather against the authority of his majesty, the Czar of Russia.

Since the great war of 1870 was concluded, has there been any year, I ask you, without its alarm of war? Just as we were returning, at the beginning of the seventies, they said: When will we have the next war? When will the "revanche" be fought? In five years at latest. They said to us then: "The question of whether we will have war, and of the success with which we shall have it (it was a representative of the center who upbraided me with it in the Reichstag), depends to-day only on Russia. Russia alone has the decision in her hands."

Perhaps I will return to this question later. In the meantime, I will continue the pictures of these forty years, and recall that in 1876 a war cloud gathered in the south; that in 1877 the Balkan war was only prevented by the Berlin congress from putting the whole of Europe in a blaze, and that quite suddenly after the congress a new vision of danger was disclosed to us in the East because Russia was offended by our action at the conference. Perhaps, later on, I will recur to this also if my strength will permit.

Then followed a certain reaction in the intimate relations of the three emperors which allowed us to look for some time into the future with more assurance; yet on the first signs of uncertainty in their relations, or because of the lapsing of the agreements they had made with each other, our public opinion showed the same nervous and, I think, exaggerated excitement with which we had to contend last year—which, at the present time, I hold to be specially uncalled for. But because I think this nervousness uncalled for now, I am far from concluding that we do not need an increase of our war footing. On the contrary. Therefore I have unrolled before you this tableau of forty years—perhaps not to your amusement. If not, I beg your pardon, but had I omitted a year from that which you yourselves had experienced with shuddering, the impression might have been lost that the state of anxiety before wars, before continually extending complications, the entanglements of

which no one can anticipate—that this condition is permanent with us; that we must reckon upon it as a permanency; and that independently of the circumstances of the moment, with the self-confidence of a great nation which is strong enough under any circumstances to take its fate into its own hands against any coalition; with the confidence in itself and in God which its own power and the righteousness of its cause, a righteousness which the care of the government will always keep with Germany—that we shall be able to foresee every possibility, and, doing so, to look forward to peace.

The long and the short of it is that in these days we must be as strong as we can; and if we will, we can be stronger than any other country of equal resources in the world. I will return to that. And it would be a crime not to use our resources. If we do not need an army prepared for war, we do not need to call for it. It depends merely on the not very important question of the cost—and it is not very important, though I mention it incidentally. I have no mind to go into figures, financial or military, but France during the last few years has spent in improving her forces three thousand millions, while we have spent hardly fifteen hundred millions, including that we are now asking for. But I leave the ministers of war and of finance to deal with that. When I say that we must strive continually to be ready for all emergencies, I advance the proposition that, on account of our geographical position, we must make greater efforts than other powers would be obliged to make in view of the same ends. We lie in the middle of Europe. We have at least three fronts on which we can be attacked. France has only an eastern boundary; Russia only its western, exposed to assault. We are, moreover, more exposed than any other people to the danger of hostile coalition because of our geographical position, and because, perhaps, of the feeble power of cohesion which, until now, the German people has exhibited when compared with others. At any rate, God has placed us in a position where our neighbors will prevent us from falling into a condition of sloth—of wallowing in the mire of mere existence. On one side of us He has set the French, a most warlike and restless nation; and He has allowed to

become exaggerated in the Russians fighting tendencies which had not become apparent in them during the earlier part of the century. So we are spurred forward on both sides to endeavors which, perhaps, we would not make otherwise. The pike in the European carp pond will not allow us to become carp, because they make us feel their stings in both our sides. They force us to an effort which, perhaps, we would not make otherwise, and they force us also to a cohesion among ourselves as Germans which is opposed to our innermost nature; otherwise we would prefer to struggle with each other. But when we are enfiladed by the press of France and Russia, it compels us to stand together, and through such compression it will so increase our fitness for cohesion that we may finally come into the same condition of indivisibility which is natural to other people—which thus far we have lacked. We must respond to this dispensation of Providence, however, by making ourselves so strong that the pike can do nothing more than encourage us to exert ourselves. We had, years ago, in the times of the Holy Alliance (I recall an old American song which I learned from my dead friend, Motley:—

"In good old colonial times,
When we lived under a king)"—

we had then patriarchal times, and with them plenty of stakes wherewith to make a palisade, and plenty of dikes to keep out the wild European floods. That was the German Confederation, and the true beginning, and continuance, and conclusion of the German Confederation was the Holy Alliance, for whose service it was made. We depended on Russia and Austria, and, above everything, we relied on our own modesty, which did not allow us to speak before the rest of the company had spoken. We have lost all that, and we must help ourselves. The Holy Alliance was shipwrecked in the Crimean war—through no fault of ours. The German Confederation has been destroyed by us because our existence under it was neither tolerable for us nor for the German people. Both have ceased to exist. After the dissolution of the German Confederation, after the war of 1866, we would have been obliged to reckon on

isolation for Prussia or north Germany, had we been obliged to stop at reckoning with the fact that on no side would they forgive us the new and great successes which we had obtained. Never do other powers look with pleasure on the triumphs of a neighbor.

Our connection with Russia was not disturbed, however, by the events of 1866. In 1866 the memory of the politics of Count von Buol and of Austrian politics during the Crimean war was too fresh in Russia to allow them to think of supporting the Austrian against the Prussian monarchy, or of renewing the campaign which Czar Nicholas had conducted for Austria in 1849. For us, therefore, there remained a natural inclination toward Russia, which, foreseen in the last century, had in this its recognized origin in the politics of Czar Alexander I. To him Prussia owes thanks indeed. In 1813 he could easily have turned on the Polish frontiers and concluded peace. Later he could have brought about the fall of Prussia. We have then, as a fact, to thank, for the restoration of the old footing, the goodwill of Czar Alexander I.; or, if you are inclined to be skeptical, say, to the need felt in Russian politics for Prussia. This feeling of gratitude has controlled the administration of Frederick William the Third.

The balance which Russia had on its account with Prussia was used up through the friendship, I may say through the serviceability, of Prussia during the entire reign of Czar Nicholas, and, I may add, settled at Olmultz. At Olmutz Czar Nicholas did not take the part of Prussia, did not shield us from adverse experience, did not guard us against humiliation; for, on the whole, he leaned toward Austria more than toward Prussia. The idea that during his administration he owed thanks to Russia results from a historical legend. But while Czar Nicholas lived, we, on our side, did not violate the tradition with Russia. During the Crimean War, as I have already told you, we stood by Russia in spite of threats and of some hazard. His majesty, the late king, had no desire to play a decided part in the war with a strong army, as I think he could easily have done. We had concluded treaties by which we were bound to put a hundred thousand men in the field by a set time. I advised his majesty that we should put, not a hundred

thousand, but two hundred thousand in the field, and to put them there à cheval, so that we could use them right and left; so that his majesty would have been the final arbiter of the fortunes of the Crimean War. But his late majesty was not inclined to warlike undertakings, and the people ought to be grateful to him for it. I was younger and less experienced then than I am now. We bore no malice for Olmutz, however, during the Crimean War. We came out of the Crimean War as a friend of Russia, and while I was ambassador to Russia I enjoyed the fruit of this friendship in a very favorable reception at court and in Russian society. Our attitude toward Austria in the Italian war was not to the taste of the Russian cabinet, but it had no unfavorable consequences. Our Austrian war of 1866 was looked upon with a certain satisfaction. No one in Russia then grudged Austria what she got. In the year 1870 we had, in taking our stand and making our defense, the satisfaction of coincidently rendering a service to our Russian friends in the Black Sea. The opening of the Black Sea by the contracting powers would never have been probable if the Germans had not been victorious in the neighborhood of Paris. Had we been defeated, for example, I think the conclusion of the London agreement would not have been so easily in Russia's favor. So the war of 1870 left no ill humor between us and Russia.

The bill will bring us an increase of troops capable of bearing arms—a possible increase, which, if we do not need it, we need not call out, but can leave the men at home. But we will have it ready for service if we have arms for it. And that is a matter of primary importance. I remember the carbine which was furnished by England to our landwehr in 1813, and with which I had some practise as a hunter—that was no weapon for a soldier. We can get arms suddenly for an emergency, but if we have them ready for it, then this bill will count for a strengthening of our peace forces and a reenforcement of the peace league as great as if a fourth great power had joined the alliance with an army of seven hundred thousand men—the greatest yet put in the field.

I think, too, that this powerful reenforcement of the army will have a quieting effect on our own people, and will

in some measure relieve the nervousness of our exchanges, of our press, and of our public opinion. I hope they all will be comforted if they make it clear to themselves that after this reenforcement, and from the moment of the signature and publication of the bill, the soldiers are there. But arms are necessary, and we must provide better ones if we wish to have an army of triarians—of the best manhood that we have among our people; of fathers of family over thirty years old. And we must give them the best arms that can be had. We must not send them into battle with what we have not thought good enough for our young troops of the line. But our steadfast men, our fathers of family, our Samsons, such as we remember seeing hold the bridge at Versailles, must have the best arms on their shoulders, and the best clothing to protect them against the weather which can be had from anywhere. We must not be niggardly in this. And I hope it will reassure our countrymen if they think now it will be the case—as I do not believe—that we are likely to be attacked on both sides at once. There is a possibility of it, for, as I have explained to you in the history of the Forty Years' War, all manner of coalitions may occur. But if it should occur we could hold the defensive on our borders with a million good soldiers. At the same time we could hold in reserve a half million or more—almost a million, indeed—and send them forward as they were needed. Some one has said to me: "The only result of that will be that the others will increase their forces also." But they cannot. They have long ago reached the maximum. We lowered it in 1867 because we thought that, having the North-German Confederation, we could make ourselves easier and exempt men over thirty-two. In consequence our neighbors have adopted a longer term of service—many of them a twenty-year term. They have a maximum as high as ours, but they cannot touch us in quality. Courage is equal in all civilized nations. The Russians or the French acquit themselves as bravely as the Germans. But our people, our seven hundred thousand men, are veterans trained in service, tried soldiers who have not yet forgotten their training. And no people in the world can touch us in this, that we have the material for officers and under officers to command this army. That is

what they cannot imitate. The whole tendency of popular education leads to that in Germany as it does in no other country. The measure of education necessary to fit an officer or under officer to meet the demands which the soldier makes on him exists with us to a much greater extent than with any other people. We have more material for officers and under officers than any other country, and we have a corps of officers that no other country can approach. In this and in the excellence of our corps of under officers, who are really the pupils of our officers' corps, lies our superiority. The course of education which fits an officer to meet the strong demands made on his position for self-denial, for the duty of comradeship, and for fulfilling the extraordinarily difficult social duties whose fulfilment is made necessary among us by the comradeship which, thank God! exists in the highest degree among officers and men without the least detriment to discipline—they cannot imitate us in that—that relationship between officers and men which, with a few unfortunate exceptions, exists in the German army. But the exceptions confirm the rule, and so we can say that no German officer leaves his soldiers under fire, but brings them out even at the risk of his own life; while, on the other hand, no German soldier, as we know by experience, forsakes his officer.

If other armies intend to supply with officers and sub-officers as many troops as we intend to have at once, then they must educate the officers; for no untaught fool is fit to command a company, and much less is he fit to fulfil the difficult duties which an officer owes to his men if he is to keep their love and respect. The measure of education which is demanded for that, and the qualities which, among us especially, are expressed in comradeship and sympathy by the officer—*that* no rule and no regulation in the world can impress on the officers of other countries. In *that* we are superior to all, and in that they cannot imitate us. On that point I have no fear.

But there is still another advantage to be derived from the adoption of this bill: The very strength for which we strive shows our peaceful disposition. That sounds paradoxical, but still it is true.

No man would attack us when we have such a powerful

war machine as we wish to make the German army. If I were to come before you to-day and say to you—supposing me to be convinced that the conditions are different from what they are—if I were to say to you: "We are strongly threatened by France and Russia; it is evident that we will be attacked; my conviction as a diplomat, considering the military necessities of the case, is that it is expedient for us to take the defensive by striking the first blow, as we are now in a position to do; an aggressive war is to our advantage, and I beg the Reichstag for a milliard or half a milliard to begin it at once against both our neighbors"—indeed, gentlemen, I do not know that you would have sufficient confidence in me to consent. I hope you would not.

But if you were to do it, it would not satisfy me. If we, in Germany, should wish to wage war with the full exertion of our national strength, it must be a war with which all who engage in it, all who offer themselves as sacrifices in it—in short the whole nation, takes part as one man; it must be a people's war; it must be a war carried on with the enthusiasm of 1870, when we were ruthlessly attacked. I well remember the ear-splitting, joyful shouts at the Cologne railway station; it was the same from Berlin to Cologne; and it was the same here in Berlin. The waves of public feeling in favor of war swept us in to it whether we wished or not. It must always be so if the power of a people such as ours is to be exerted to the full. It will be very difficult, however, to make it clear to the provinces and states of the confederation and to their peoples that war is now unavoidably necessary. They would ask: "Are you sure of that? Who knows?" In short, when we came to actual hostilities, the weight of such imponderable considerations would be much heavier against us than the material opposition we would meet from our enemies. "Holy Russia" would be irritated; France would bristle with bayonets as far as the Pyrenees. It would be the same everywhere. A war which was not decreed by the popular will could be carried on if once the constituted authorities had finally decided on it as a necessity; it would be carried on vigorously, and perhaps successfully, after the first fire and the sight of blood. But it would not be a finish fight in its

spirit with such fire and élan behind it as we would have in a war in which we were attacked. Then all Germany from Memel to Lake Constance would flame out like a powder mine; the country would bristle with arms, and no enemy would be rash enough to join issues with the "furor Teutonicus" thus roused by attack.

We must not lose sight of such considerations, even if we are now superior to our future opponents, as many military critics besides our own consider us to be. All our own critics are convinced of our superiority. Naturally every soldier believes it. He would come very near to being a failure as a soldier if he did not wish for war and feel full assurance of victory. If our rivals sometimes suspect that it is fear of the result which makes us peaceful, they are grievously in error. We believe as thoroughly in the certainty of our victory in a righteous cause as any lieutenant in a foreign garrison can believe in his third glass of champagne—and perhaps we have more ground for our assurance. It is not fear which makes us peaceable, but the consciousness of our strength—the consciousness that if we were attacked at the most unfavorable time, we are strong enough for defense and for keeping in view the possibility of leaving it to the providence of God to remove in the meantime the necessity for war.

I am never for an offensive war, and if war can come only through our initiative, it will not begin. Fire must be kindled by some one before it can burn, and we will not kindle it. Neither the consciousness of our strength, as I have just represented it, nor the trust in our alliances, will prevent us from continuing with our accustomed zeal our accustomed efforts to keep the peace. We will not allow ourselves to be led by bad temper; we will not yield to prejudice. It is undoubtedly true that the threats, the insults, the provocations which have been directed against us have aroused great and natural animosities on our side. And it is hard to rouse such feelings in the Germans, for they are less sensitive to the dislike of others toward them than any other nation. We are taking pains, however, to soften these animosities, and in the future, as in the past, we will strive to keep the peace with our neighbors—especially with Russia. When I say "especially with Russia,"

I mean that France offers us no security for the success of our efforts, though I will not say that it does not help. We will never seek occasion to quarrel. We will never attack France. In the many small occasions for trouble which the disposition of our neighbors to spy and to bribe has given us, we have made pleasant and amicable settlements. I would hold it grossly criminal to allow such trifles either to occasion a great national war or to make it probable. There are occasions when it is true that the "more reasonable gives way." I name Russia especially, and I have the same confidence in the result I had a year ago, when my expression gave this "Liberal" paper here occasion for black type. But I have it without running after—or, as a German paper expressed it, "groveling before Russia." That time has gone by. We no longer sue for favor, either in France or in Russia. The Russian press and Russian public opinion have shown the door to an old, powerful, and attached friend, as we were. We will not force ourselves upon them. We have sought to regain the old confidential relationship, but we will run after no one. But that does not prevent us from observing—it rather spurs us on to observe with redoubled care—the treaty rights of Russia. Among these treaty rights are some which are not conceded by all our friends: I mean the rights which at the Berlin congress Russia won in the matter of Bulgaria.

In consequence of the resolution of the congress, Russia up to 1885 chose as prince a near relative of the czar, concerning whom no one asserted or could assert that he was anything else than a Russian dependent. It appointed the minister of war and a greater part of the officials. In short, it governed Bulgaria. There is no possible doubt of it. The Bulgarians, or a part of them, or their prince—I do not know which—were not satisfied. There was a coup d'état, and there has been a defection from Russia. This has created a situation which we have no call to change by force of arms, though its existence does not change theoretically the rights which Russia gained from the conference. But if Russia should seek to establish its rights forcibly, I do not know what difficulties might arise, and it does not concern us to know. We will not support forcible measures and will not advise them. I do not believe there

is any disposition toward them. I am sure no such inclination exists. But if through diplomatic means, through the intervention of the sultan as the suzerain of Bulgaria, Russia seeks its rights, then I assume that it is the province of loyal German statesmanship to give an unmistakable support to the provisions of the Berlin treaty, and to stand by the interpretation which, without exception, we gave it —an interpretation on which the voice of the Bulgarians cannot make me err. Bulgaria, the little state between the Danube and the Balkans, is certainly not of sufficient importance to justify plunging Europe into war from Moscow to the Pyrenees, from the North Sea to Palermo—a war the issue of which no one could foresee, at the end of which no one could tell what the fighting had been about.

So I can say openly that the position of the Russian press, the unfriendliness we have experienced from Russian public opinion, will not prevent us from supporting Russia in a diplomatic attempt to establish its rights as soon as it makes up its mind to assert them in Bulgaria. I say deliberately, "as soon as Russia expresses the wish." We have put ourselves to some trouble heretofore to meet the views of Russia on the strength of reliable hints; but we have lived to see the Russian press attacking, as hostile to Russia, the very things in German politics which were prompted by a desire to anticipate Russia's wishes. We did that at the congress, but it will not happen again. If Russia officially asks us to support measures for the restoration in Bulgaria of the situation approved by the congress, with the sultan as suzerain, I would not hesitate to advise his majesty, the emperor, that it should be done. This is the demand which the treaties make on our loyalty to a neighbor with whom, be the mood what it will, we have to maintain neighborly relations and defend great common interests of monarchy, such as the interests of order against its antagonists in all Europe—with a neighbor, I say, whose sovereign has a perfect understanding in this regard with the allied sovereigns. I do not doubt that when the Czar of Russia finds that the interests of his great empire of a hundred million people require war, he will make war. But his interests cannot possibly prompt him to make war against us. I do not think it at all probable that such

a question of interest is likely to present itself. I do not believe that a disturbance of the peace is imminent—if I may recapitulate—and I beg that you will consider the pending measure without regard to that thought or that apprehension, looking on it rather as a full restoration of the mighty power which God has created in the German people—a power to be used if we need it. If we do not need it we will not use it, and we will seek to avoid the necessity for its use. This attempt is made somewhat more difficult by threatening articles in foreign newspapers, and I may give special admonition to the outside world against the continuance of such articles. They lead to nothing. The threats made against us—not by the government, but in the newspapers—are incredibly stupid, when it is remembered that they assume that a great and proud power such as the German empire is capable of being intimidated by an array of black spots made by a printer on paper, a mere marshaling of words. If they would give up that idea, we could reach a better understanding with both our neighbors. Every country is finally answerable for the wanton mischief done by its newspapers, and the reckoning is liable to be presented some day in the shape of a final decision from some other country. We can be bribed very easily—perhaps too easily—with love and good-will. But with threats, never!

We Germans fear God, and nothing else in the world.

It is the fear of God which makes us love peace and keep it. He who breaks it against us ruthlessly will learn the meaning of the warlike love of the Fatherland which in 1813 rallied to the standard the entire population of the then small and weak kingdom of Prussia; he will learn, too, that this patriotism is now the common property of the entire German nation, so that whoever attacks Germany will find it unified in arms, every warrior having in his heart the steadfast faith that God will be with us.

JAMES GILLESPIE BLAINE

A CENTURY OF PROTECTION

[James G. Blaine, statesman and orator, was born at West Brownsville, Pa., January 31, 1830. At the close of his collegiate course he became a teacher in a military institute at Blue Lick Spring, Ky., which position he resigned to take up the study of law in Pennsylvania. At the age of twenty-four he settled in Augusta, Me., and took up journalism. As editor of the "Kennebec Journal" he exerted an influence in Whig politics, but adopted the principles of Republicanism on the organization of that party. He was later editor of the "Portland Daily Advertiser." In 1860, having laid the foundations of a fortune, he abandoned newspaper work for politics. In 1858 he had entered the state legislature, and remained a member of that body until he was transferred to the national Congress. In 1862 he went to the House of Representatives at Washington, and in 1869 was appointed speaker. During the Hayes administration Mr. Blaine was senator from Maine, and at its close came before the convention a second time for the nomination, which, however, went to James A. Garfield. Blaine became Secretary of State in Garfield's cabinet. Soon after President Garfield's death he resigned his office. Retiring to private life he produced his valuable work, "Twenty Years of Congress," an account of the political life of the capital in which he had figured so conspicuously. On February 27, 1882, he delivered his eulogy on Garfield before the President and both houses of Congress. In 1884 he was nominated for President by the Republican party, but lost the election to Grover Cleveland. He died in 1893. His views on protection are set forth in a clear and enlightening manner in the following speech, which was made in New York City, 1888.]

MR. CHAIRMAN and fellow citizens: General Harrison has shown remarkable ability in condensing a whole argument within the dimensions of a proverb. This is a great and rare talent. It was the striking feature in Franklin's mode of reasoning, and was practised by Lincoln with irresistible effect. When General Harrison, in his letter of acceptance, described the dogmatic free-traders as

"students of maxims, and not of markets," he exposed in one brief sentence the fallacy and the weakness of their economic creed. They are in truth simply theorists, perpetually arguing from arbitrary premises to an ideal conclusion, and blindly rejecting the teachings of a century's experience—a century during which protective revenue tariffs have had an equal chance to exhibit the results of their operations and of their relative effect upon all the material interests of the country. Whoever deceives himself as to the facts of the history of this long period does so wilfully or ignorantly.

From the foundation of the government to the war of 1812 there was no embittered controversy on the question of the tariff. The first act passed for levying duties on "foreign goods, wares, and merchandise," was reported by Mr. Madison, afterward President of the United States, and was in its preamble declared to be "for the support of government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufactures." It was the second enactment placed on the statute book of the United States, and received President Washington's approval on an auspicious and prophetic anniversary—the Fourth of July, 1789. It affirmed both the power and the policy of protective duties—the affirmation being sealed by the unanimous vote of the Senate, and by a majority of more than five to one in the House of Representatives—both houses containing many of those who had taken a prominent part in framing the Constitution of the United States. Since that vote all arguments against the constitutional right and power of the government to levy protective duties have been as futile as a contradiction of Euclid's demonstrations.

Between the adoption of the first tariff act and the beginning of the war of 1812 twelve additional acts were passed, generally increasing the rate of duty and adding to their protective power. The indisputable effect of these protective acts had been to stimulate the growth of all the material interests of the country in a remarkable degree. The population increased in a greater ratio from 1790 to 1810 than in any subsequent twenty years in the life of the republic, and this was an index of the growth of agricul-

ture, manufactures, and commerce, which was so great as to draw the attention of all Europe.

The annual messages of Washington and Jefferson, representing in their persons both the political schools into which the people were then divided, give ample testimony to this end. In his message of December 1795, six years after the national government was organized, Washington spoke of "our agriculture, commerce, and manufactures prospering beyond former example," and "every part of the Union displaying indications of rapid and various improvement; with burdens so light as scarcely to be perceived." In his message of the following year he urged upon Congress "the necessity of accelerating the establishment of certain useful manufactures by the intervention of legislative aid and protection."

In his first message, delivered in December 1801, Jefferson felicitated Congress upon the revenue derived from tariff duties, and suggested that "there is now reasonable ground of confidence that we may safely dispense with all internal taxes." Dispensing with "all internal taxes," and relying upon the tariff duties for "support of the government and the payment of the public debt," was Jefferson's conception of a financial policy—a policy sternly resisted by the party to-day that claims (however absurdly) to be the inheritor of his principles.

In his message of December 1807 Jefferson was able to advise Congress of a heavy surplus in the revenue. The only duty which he proposed to remit in consequence of this anticipation was that on salt, an article of high price at that time, and very insufficiently supplied by our own product. But with the salt duty totally repealed, and what is known as the "Mediterranean fund" at an end, Jefferson informed Congress that "there will still ere long be an accumulation of moneys in the treasury beyond the instalment of the public debt which we are permitted by contract to pay. . . . The question, therefore, now comes forward: To what other objects shall these surpluses be appropriated, and the whole surplus of impost after the entire discharge of the public debt and when purposes of war shall not call for them? Shall we suppress the impost and give that advantage to foreign over domestic manufactures?"

This weighty question was answered by Jefferson in the negative. He was not frightened into an abandonment of the protective system because it happened to yield a surplus, nor did he recommend the overturning of a fixed industrial policy on which the growth and wealth of the country were founded, simply because the National Treasury shared the general prosperity of the country and overflowed with money. This subject had taken strong hold on Jefferson's mind, and the next year (1808), in returning to the subject in his annual message to Congress, he said: "The probable accumulation of the surplus of revenue beyond what can be applied to the payment of the public debt, whenever the freedom and safety of our commerce shall be restored, merits the consideration of Congress. Shall it lie unproductive in the public vaults? Shall the revenue be reduced? Or shall it not rather be appropriated to the improvement of roads, canals, rivers, education, and other great foundations of prosperity and union, under the powers which Congress may already possess, or such amendments to the Constitution as may be approved by the states?"

So earnestly was Jefferson in favor of using the surplus which was yielded by a protective tariff, for some great national benefit, that he was ready and anxious to amend the Constitution to supply any deficiency of power which his strict construction creed might find. Nor was it a trifling surplus which he was ready to use for national improvements. It amounted to $14,000,000—equivalent on a mere basis of population to a surplus to-day of $150,000,000, and equivalent, on the basis of relative national wealth of the two periods, to a surplus of $450,000,000. It never occurred to Mr. Jefferson's mind—the most comprehensive and far-seeing mind of all the presidents of the United States, his peer being found, if found at all, in Abraham Lincoln alone—I say it never occurred to Mr. Jefferson's mind that it would be a wise policy for the government, or an advantageous one for the people, to loan the treasury surplus to a few favorite banks, as the administration of President Cleveland has done. Mr. Jefferson looked to higher aims and ends—something that would benefit the nation at large, and be of equal and impartial advantage to all the people.

In his message touching the useful purposes to which the treasury surplus might be applied, Mr. Jefferson apprehended the possibility of trouble with England, and had already recommended the "embargo." His wise and beneficent designs were thus frustrated for the time, and the whole country was compelled to face the probability of war with Great Britain long before actual hostilities were begun. When there was no longer a doubt of war, Congress took the wise precaution of passing a tariff bill in the highest degree protective. All existing duties were doubled, and ten per cent. was added to this rate upon all importations in vessels sailing under a foreign flag. This act was approved by Madison, July 1, 1812, and, despite the three years of war that followed, the country made rapid strides in development, and was far richer at the close of the war than at its beginning. American manufactures had indeed been greatly stimulated from 1808 to 1815, first by the "embargo," and still further by the period of actual hostilities.

It is worthy of special mark that up to this time there had been no sharp division of party lines on the tariff. The various acts were passed with the general acquiescence of all parties, with some difference on minor details. But on the return of peace the war tariff, so called, expired by its own limitation, and in its stead followed the famous tariff of 1816. It was not, however, passed without discussion and resistance. Its advocates, as near as an analogy might be found in eras so remote and situations so different, made the same heedless and unreasoning blunder that the free-trade Democrats and the supporters of the Mills bill are making to-day. Its opponents foretold the disasters that would follow its enactment. What these disasters were I shall not myself attempt to describe, but shall quote two contemporary witnesses of illustrious fame—one the greatest of Whig leaders, the other a Democratic statesman of lasting renown.

Mr. Clay, at that time Speaker of the House, in a speech during the session of 1823–4, seven years after the tariff of 1816 had been adopted, said: "The general distress which pervades the whole country is forced upon us by numerous facts of the most incontestable character. It is indicated by the diminished exports of native produce; by the de-

pressed and reduced state of our foreign navigation; by our diminished commerce; by successive unthrashed crops of grain perishing in our barns for want of market; by the alarming diminution of the circulating medium; by the universal complaint of the want of employment, and a consequent reduction of the wages of labor; . . . and, above all, by the low and depressed state of the value of almost every description of property in the nation, which has, on an average, sunk not less than about fifty per cent. within a few years. . . . It is most painful for me to dwell on the gloom of this picture. But I have exaggerated nothing. Perfect fidelity to the original would have authorized me to throw on deeper and darker hues."

Colonel Benton's description of the same period fully sustains the dark picture drawn by Mr. Clay. He gives this vivid description of the "hard times": "No price for property or produce. No sales but those of the sheriff and the marshal. No purchasers at execution sales but the creditor or some hoarder of money. No employment for industry, no demand for labor, no sale for the products of the farm, no sound of the hammer but that of the auctioneer knocking down property. Stop laws, property laws, replevin laws, stay laws, loan office laws, the intervention of the legislature between the creditor and the debtor—this was the business of the legislatures in three fourths of the states of the Union. . . . No medium of exchange but depreciated paper; no change even, but little bits of foul paper, marked so many cents, and signed by some tradesman, barber, or innkeeper; exchanges deranged to the extent of fifty or one hundred per cent. Distress the universal cry of the people. Relief, the universal demand, thundered at the doors of all legislatures, state and federal."

"Relief" came, and it was through the enactment of the protective tariff of 1824. The relief was profound and general, reaching all classes, the farmer, the manufacturer, the ship-owner, the mechanic, and the day-laborer. The change was as great as was wrought in the financial condition of the United States when Hamilton smote the rock of public credit, and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth. It may be instructive to the free-trade Democrats of to-day, from the President of the United States to the

ward orator, to read the yeas and nays in the two houses of Congress by which this protective act was passed. He will find among its supporters not only Colonel Benton, whose graphic outline of the previous distress has just been quoted, but he will find General Andrew Jackson, then a senator from Tennessee and afterward President; also Martin Van Buren, then a senator from New York and afterward President; also James Buchanan, then a representative from Pennsylvania and afterward President; Richard M. Johnson, then a senator from Kentucky, afterward Vice-President of the United States; Louis McLane, then a representative from Delaware, and afterward a member of General Jackson's cabinet; General Sam Houston, then representative from Tennessee, and afterward senator from Texas.

Following these great leaders came scores of Democrats in Congress, who, differing from the Democrats of to-day, believed that a protective tariff was the surest and most effective measure for the financial safety and general prosperity of the country.

After four years of prosperity under the tariff of 1824, and when the public men had gained courage in the cause of protection, a measure still more effective and imposing still higher duties was passed in 1828. Colonel Benton, who supported the tariff bill of 1824, voted also for the tariff of 1828; so did Mr. Van Buren and Richard M. Johnson, who became vice-president under him; so did Mr. Buchanan, so did Louis McLane, so did Mr. Hendricks, of Indiana—uncle of the late vice-president; and, last of all, so did Silas Wright, the ablest Democrat ever sent to Congress from the State of New York. These great men, the founders of the Democratic party, were not afraid of the doctrine of protection, nor were they squeamish in its application. Wool didn't frighten them, as it apparently has President Cleveland. They levied on wool a specific duty of four cents per pound, and an ad valorem duty of forty per cent., with a proviso that at the end of two years it should be raised to fifty per cent. At that rate to-day it would impose a much higher tariff than the ten cents duty in which President Cleveland finds especial danger to our national finances.

Following the tariff of 1828, a Southern hostility began to develop, confined mainly, though not with precision, to the states that afterward rebelled against the national government. Mr. Calhoun originally favored protection, but he had come to the conclusion that manufactures could not be established in the planting states of the South, that free labor and slave labor could not be made to harmonize, and that the example of free labor would breed discontent among the negroes and ultimately undermine and overturn slavery, or at least render it unprofitable, which was equivalent to its destruction. He had, moreover, since his quarrel with Jackson, been compelled to give up all prospect of the presidency, and had no hope of conciliating the Northern Democracy on the basis of its existing organization, which was firmly in the hands of the supporters of Jackson and Van Buren. Mr. Calhoun felt and foresaw that, with the Southern states united in defense of slavery and in hostility to protection, he could ultimately control the policy of the Democratic party. Just then and just there began the change of the Northern Democratic party on the tariff, and of Northern "doughfaceism" on the question of slavery. Free trade and the extension of slavery formed a national partnership, and were thenceforward made the corner-stones of Democratic policy.

Attempted nullification followed, and after a hot contention a compromise tariff bill was agreed upon, with a sliding scale downward for ten years, with the certainty, as the protectionists believed, that it would end in commercial and financial disaster. The disaster came sooner than was expected, and in 1837, the year after the election of Mr. Van Buren, a panic came upon the country that beggars description for its severity and distress. Many men still living can testify to the widespread suffering and the general derangement of all departments of business. The condition of the country between 1816 and 1824, as described by Mr. Clay and Colonel Benton, was exceeded by the prostration following the panic of 1837. A peculiar feature in both cases was the deep distress of the farming interest. Mortgages and forced sales in every direction, thousands of men out of work or toiling for twenty-five cents a day or less, and other thousands compelled to rely on the soup-

houses for the food which, for lack of opportunity to labor, they were unable to supply for themselves.

The people naturally revolted against the administration. The Democratic party was justly accused of making money scarce by its banking policy, and of crushing all demands for labor by its tariff policy; and, under the joint influence of the two, it went down under an avalanche of popular disfavor in the presidential election of 1840. In 1836, when Van Buren was elected, his Whig opponent, General Harrison, carried only seven states; and in 1840, when General Harrison was elected, Van Buren carried only seven states. The contrast was even stronger in the electoral vote, for Harrison had seventy-three in 1836, and Van Buren had but sixty in 1840. It was a popular uprising against the Democratic party, a revolt against free trade, a powerful affirmation in favor of a protective policy.

The proof of the Whig triumph was the protective tariff of 1842, which held the same relation to the compromise tariff of 1833 that the protective tariff of 1824 held to the tariff of 1816. And again was the policy of protection most signally vindicated. The years following the enactment of the tariff of 1842 witnessed an almost phenomenal revival of all industrial pursuits in the country. All interests felt it, and the popular sentiment was so widely and deeply touched by it that in 1844, in the presidential contest between Mr. Clay and Mr. Polk, the latter was compelled to write a letter expressing his belief in the value of protection; and a Pennsylvania candidate, George M. Dallas, had been associated with him on the ticket, in order that the people might have the pledge of the strongest protection state in the Union as a guaranty that the protective system would be safe under a Democratic administration.

But under the malign influence of the Southern leaders the ablest exponent of free trade in the country, Robert J. Walker, of Mississippi, was made secretary of the Treasury. Under the whip and spur of Southern dominion, and without even an apology for the perfidy involved, the protective tariff of 1842 was broken down, and the free trade tariff of 1846 was placed upon the statute book by the casting vote of Vice-President Dallas, who had stood as the political hostage that protection should be maintained; while Silas

Wright, to whom the vice-presidential nomination was first offered, and who had voted for the high tariff of 1828, ran for governor of New York, and innocently yet powerfully aided in a deception of which he afterward repented in sackcloth and ashes.

Great apprehension was felt by Whigs and Democrats alike as to what effect the tariff of 1846 would have upon the industrial interests of the country. The protectionists expected that bad results would be visible within a year, but an extraordinary series of incidents, or accidents if you please, postponed the evil day. Coeval with President Polk's approval of the tariff bill came the declaration of war with Mexico. That led to a demand for more than 100,000 men for enlistment and camp-followers, and caused an outlay of $150,000,000 beyond the ordinary expenditures of government within the ensuing two years. Before the great stimulus given to all departments of trade by these large disbursements began to lessen, a great famine occurred in Ireland. That led to an altogether unprecedented export of breadstuffs, and that, of course, brought large shipments of money from Europe. Before the effect produced on our trade by the famine had ceased, the European revolutions of 1848 began, and trade and manufactures over the whole continent, from Madrid to St. Petersburg, were disturbed, and in many cases thrown into hopeless confusion and panic. This stopped importations, and gave to the American manufacturer a far larger field than he could have had if a normal condition of business had existed in Europe.

While these causes were in full operation and were producing a prodigious effect upon our prosperity, the whole country was electrified, at the close of the year 1848, by the tidings that gold had been discovered in California, which we had acquired only a few months before from Mexico. The precious metal flowed to us in rich streams from the Pacific slope for the next six years, and opened avenues of trade unknown before. It drew young and vigorous men by hundreds of thousands from the older states, and gave to this great metropolis of the continent, the city of New York, an impulse the like of which it had never experienced before.

It was a historic epoch in the advancement of the coun-

try, and when, at the beginning of 1854, the output of gold showed signs of decline, a European war supplied fresh stimulus to the trade of the United States. The three leading powers of Europe, as powers were then reckoned, England, France, and Russia, engaged in a giants' contest on the shores of the Black Sea, and the confusion which resulted throughout Europe for the next two and a half years afforded a rich harvest for the United States. Peace came in 1856. The spindles and wheels and looms, the forges and factories and furnaces of Great Britain and France were set going with renewed energy. The seas were once more unvexed, and Russia poured forth her grain in the markets of western Europe to compete with the shipments from America.

The last of the causes which had contributed to our prosperity in these ten years of happy accident was at an end, and its course had so deluded our people with the Democratic fallacy that a low tariff leads to prosperity as surely as a protective tariff, that in the spring of 1857 Congress passed a brief tariff act lowering the duties still further, and the United States set forth to depend upon its own energies, with a tariff that brought it directly in competition with the low-priced labor of Europe. We were no longer sustained by some extraordinary accident like war or famine or revolution abroad, or the discovery of vast deposits of the precious metals at home. I need not tell the result. The panic of 1857 came upon the country with crushing and disastrous effect. Every interest was prostrated, and a Democratic President, within a year from the end of the last of the extraneous causes that helped us, was compelled in his message to Congress to portray the disastrous condition of the country in as strong colors as even protectionists would have painted. Mr. Buchanan said:

"With unsurpassed plenty in all the elements of national wealth, our manufacturers have suspended, our public works are retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds are abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers are thrown out of employment and reduced to want."

And that was the downfall of the famous tariff of 1846. When left to stand alone, it stood just one year. The

people had not sufficiently heeded the tremendous influences of the accidental causes I have cited, and mistakenly believed that the ten years of prosperity were due to a low revenue tariff.

Following the panic of 1857 there were four years of "hard times." Money was scarce, specie payment was maintained by the banks with great difficulty, as the gold from the California mines had largely been shipped to Europe to pay adverse balances, and new enterprises were few in number and unprofitable in result. The country did not revive until after the election of Abraham Lincoln, and the Morrill tariff, which was the foundation and beginning of the present tariff system of the country, was enacted. Under the influence of the new protective system, despite the sudden outburst of a great civil war and all the evils that accompanied it, including the industrial paralysis of the eleven seceded states, the country was enabled to sustain itself, and to revive and increase in an extraordinary degree its manufacturing industries, and generally to enter upon a course which, for nearly the twenty-eight years which close the century of our tariff experience, has given to the United States a prosperity beyond that ever enjoyed by any country, ancient or modern, in this hemisphere or the other, upon any continent or upon the isles of the sea.

In this brief historical view of our century's experience with the tariff, these facts are, I think, incontestably established:—

First, that this country, under a low tariff, inviting sharp competition and large importations from abroad, has never prospered; but every such attempt has ended in financial and industrial disaster, prostrating every interest, most of all the agricultural, and operating without exception with peculiar severity upon the wage-earners.

Second, that at no time in our century's history has the United States ever recovered from the financial depression caused by a low tariff until a protective tariff was enacted to take its place. The tariff of 1824 relieved the long suffering that followed from the too hasty lowering of duties in the tariff of 1816; the tariff of 1842 revived the country after the compromise and destructive tariff of 1833; and the

tariff of 1861, still in force, and which Mr. Cleveland's administration is endeavoring to destroy, introduced a prosperous era after the tremendous convulsion of 1857, which was caused by the perfidiously enacted tariff of 1846.

Third, that there never has been a time since Mr. Calhoun forced the Democratic party to submit to the control of Southern leaders, as it is now ingloriously submitting to-day, that it did not, if in power, demand the repeal and destruction of a protective tariff, even when its efficient and beneficial action upon all the interests of the country was established and demonstrated beyond doubt or cavil. Mr. Calhoun forced the Democratic party in 1833 to break down the tariffs of 1824 and 1828, for which three Democratic Presidents had voted. Mr. Polk forced the Democratic party, even though it stained its political record with bad faith, to break down the tariff of 1842, which had already in its four years existence renewed the hopes of the country after a long era of depression. And now Mr. Cleveland, true to the precedents and instincts of his party, seeks to break down the present protective tariff at the risk of disturbing the industries of a continent, and to commit the American people once more to the old experiment of Democratic free trade or revenue tariff, with its inevitable disaster to the material interests of the country, and in no small degree to that mighty host who earn their day's bread by their day's work, and to whom good wages bring happiness and low wages bring misery.

The first political speech which I delivered after more than a year's absence in Europe was in this great city, last month. I then warned the laboring men of the United States that a protective tariff was their shield and bulwark; that they could break it down with their votes, or they could sustain it with their votes. I repeat that admonition in the same great city, here and now. If the great army of wage-workers in this country will not protect themselves, there is no other power that can protect them. A century's experience of the tariff should be their warning and their guide.

It is for you to say if a century's experience should be a light to your feet. It should teach you the great and useful lesson that if you do not maintain your own ground

no one else will maintain it for you. The power is in your hands. It may be wielded for your destruction, or it may be wielded for your protection and for your safety. [Loud and prolonged cheering, and waving of hats, flags, and canes.]

RICHARD PARKS BLAND

FREE SILVER

[Richard Parks Bland, an American congressman, noted for his views on the silver question, was born in Kentucky in 1835. He worked on a farm in early life, saving enough money to obtain an academic education. Then he studied law and finally settled in Missouri, from which state he was sent to Congress in 1873. He was regularly reelected until his death in 1899, with the exception of one defeat. The principal event of his congressional career was the introduction into Congress of the "Bland Bill," providing that the national government purchase silver bullion sufficient to coin at least $2,000,000 monthly, the coins themselves being legal tender. Bland delivered earnest speeches both in and out of Congress in support of his views, the tenor of which gained him his popular name of "Silver Dick." He died in 1899. The characteristic speech here given was delivered in the House of Representatives in 1890, and may be regarded as a clear exposition of his views on silver.]

MR. CONGER assumed that the great pressure for free coinage in this country comes only from the owners of silver mines, and he has alluded to the St. Louis convention and the efforts there made to educate the minds of the people of this country on the silver question. As for the lobby of which he speaks I know nothing about it. I have not seen it myself, and I have never heard of it, unless he applies that term to gentlemen who have printed documents on this subject, who have addressed the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures upon the subject, and who have adopted every means within their power to give us information upon this very important question. In that way, and to that extent, I suppose we are always beset by "lobbyists." Indeed, in that sense we might be called lobbyists ourselves—if such a term could be applied to gentlemen on this floor—because it is our duty to give each other all the information that we have upon subjects of

legislation, and to obtain information from all legitimate quarters.

My friend has also alluded to a silver "pool" and silver speculation. Mr. Speaker, there is but one way to prevent speculation in silver bullion—the same sort of speculation as you have in wheat, the same sort of speculation as you have in corn, the same sort of speculation as you have in iron and steel, and in other products. There is, I say, but one way to prevent it, and that is to give it an unlimited coinage at the mints of this country. In that way you establish for silver, as you have established for gold, a price as money which will always fix the value of the bullion at the mints, and beyond that price it cannot go, unless other countries should desire to pay a higher price for it. Any legislation that restricts the coinage of silver offers an opportunity for speculation, and that was the difficulty with the legislation of 1878, to which my colleague, the chairman of the committee, has referred. At that time it was contended that silver was depreciated, and that therefore it ought not to have the privileges of the mints of the government. The House at that time passed a free coinage bill, pure and simple. It sent that bill to the Senate. There it was amended so as to provide for the coinage of not less than $2,000,000 worth of bullion per month, and not more than $4,000,000 worth.

That was the great mistake made when this question was up for solution in 1878. There is no question in my mind that had the Congress of the United States at that time done its duty with regard to this subject, and opened the mints to the unlimited coinage of silver, it would have settled the silver question, and settled it satisfactorily to the people of this country, and we should have no such question to deal with to-day. But gentlemen contended then, as they contend now, that gold was the only proper measure of value, that gold was the only safe coin, that gold was to dominate the silver question, and that silver as a standard of value would play no part in our coinage system or in our currency system. First, it was resolved that gold, and gold alone, was the dollar, the measure of value, and because silver bullion, after having been denied the privilege of free coinage, is not worth as much as gold,

which has that privilege, for that reason it is contended that silver ought not to be coined, but should be left to be a mere object of speculation. What has been the consequence? Gentlemen who live in the great Northwestern and Western states have been the sufferers. The cry for gold has been made by Eastern capitalists and bondholders for the purpose of collecting from the taxpayers of this country enormous sums of money in excess of what the laws of the country have promised them, and in excess of what justice and right would dictate.

How is this and why is it? They say that if we coin silver here, this country will be supplied with silver circulation to such an extent that our gold will leave us and we shall have nothing but silver as our currency. What of it? Mr. Speaker, even had that occurred in 1878, and we had been practically upon a silver basis—that is, had coined silver almost exclusively, and coined but little gold—what would have been the effect upon the products of the agricultural people of this country? Why, sir, we know that the moment we resumed specie payments and gave but a limited use for silver, we compelled a flow of gold from European countries to this country, depriving them to that extent of a circulating medium. We have brought here since that time gold to the amount of $400,000,000 or $500,000,000. What effect has that had upon prices in this country? We send abroad our cotton, our wheat, our breadstuffs; they constitute our chief articles of export to foreign countries. Now, is it not to the interests of the agriculturists of this country to have high prices in foreign countries for their products? Certainly it is, because it is the price obtained abroad that fixes the price at home. If we had better prices abroad for the products of the farms of this country, there would be better prices at home and a larger surplus to export. How has that prevented higher prices, or, in other words, how has it operated to continue in this country lower prices, especially for all farm products? It has been done in the way I have indicated. We have been drawing upon the stock of circulating gold of European countries. We have to that extent decreased their circulating medium and lowered prices there—lowered prices in the very markets where it is our interest to in-

crease them. Had European countries to-day $500,000,000 or $600,000,000 more gold in circulation than they have, the effect would be, as a matter of course, to increase to that extent, or in that proportion, the prices of every article we export and sell in these markets. It would increase the price of farm products in foreign markets at least fifteen per cent., and would prevent the fall of such commodities in this country to a corresponding extent.

Then, sir, suppose all that is claimed with regard to the coinage of silver should be true—that our currency would practically consist of silver, that our gold would go abroad—the effect would be to raise prices abroad, and also to raise the prices here; and that is the very object of the free coinage of silver. Unless that should occur there would be but little benefit from it. Now, what do we find to be the case in all silver-using countries? Take India for instance. The statistics show that since we have demonetized silver here, and since the European countries have discontinued its coinage, this policy has acted as a bonus for the export trade of India. She to-day is coming in sharp competition with the wheat-fields of the West. Why? For two reasons, the main reason being that her currency has not been contracted; her prices have kept up; her business enterprises have been in a prosperous condition; and thus she has been enabled to produce largely beyond what she did before. Secondly, she did not have par exchange with European countries; to send her silver to Europe and undertake to settle her balances with it would entail a loss; therefore she is raising wheat, she is raising cotton, and thus producing articles of commerce that have not lost their purchasing power in those countries; and she is sending to them those articles instead of money. In this way she not only retains her money at home, but is shipping largely to European countries articles that we ought to ship. Thus we are brought in direct competition with her.

My claim is that silver-using countries have not felt the steady decline in prices that we have. The fact is that when they send their products—cotton and other similar articles—to be sold in European countries at a gold price, they gain the difference between silver and gold, and it pays them better to send their commodities than to send

their money. They are selling them at gold prices, and on account of the demonetization of silver they recoup by purchasing silver in the London markets.

I want to impress this point upon the agricultural interests of this country: that it is not to their advantage to have low prices in European countries, because agricultural products constitute nearly all of our export trade; and by draining these countries of their gold, of their coin, we are constantly reducing prices there; and there is a reaction on prices here, which continue to fall and fall.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think if gentlemen will take pains to inquire into the state of public feeling on this subject, and especially as to the feeling existing in agricultural communities throughout the West, they will ascertain the fact that these people believe we ought to have a large increase in the circulating medium, and they believe that this increase ought to be based upon something that is permanent, something that is constitutional, that is legal, and that the experience of the past warrants us in resorting to.

The statement is made that they desire a large increase in the circulating medium; they believe that the most practical mode of getting that increase is by the use of silver and by its free coinage; and that statement comes from an organization that cannot be denounced on this floor as "lobbyists," and you may go into Iowa, and Wisconsin, and Michigan, and you may go into Illinois, Indiana, into Missouri, into Kansas, leaving all the Southern country out, and find that the same sentiment prevails, the same demand is being heard, and I have not yet read a single resolution passed by the farmers in all of these states upon the currency question in which they have not directly demanded the free coinage of silver. The gentleman from Iowa and other gentlemen can denominate them as lobbyists if they please; they are not interested in the question as silver men or silver bullion holders. They are interested in the increased circulation of the volume of money in this country, and they are interested in that direction to have good money in circulation which is silver.

From 1792 to 1873 we had that system of money which the Senate bill will reestablish. We tried it in this country for over eighty years. It is no experiment, then, because

we know its results; but, simply because of the fact that Congress saw fit in 1873 to suspend the coinage of the standard silver dollar, and because gentlemen who desire to collect from the people, the taxpayers of this country, an enormous tribute in the way of low prices and high money, because they are demanding gold and gold only, we are to surrender the history of the past, and we are to surrender one of the money metals of the world to accommodate a few Shylocks in America. Mr. Speaker, I hope it will not be the pleasure of the House to agree to such a proposition.

As I stated before, when this question was under discussion—the act of 1878—when the question was discussed in the House and acted upon, had we settled it then as we ought to have settled it, we would have had no silver question with us to-day. Now the opportunity is presented to us to remedy the evil. Now again is the opportunity offered to do right by repealing virtually the laws that demonetized silver, and rehabilitate it in its proper position as a money metal in this country.

How shall it be done? The Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures have recommended non-concurrence in the Senate amendments to the House bill. They insist upon the passage of the House bill without amendment. They insist upon a bill that in reality makes a commodity of silver. They insist upon a bill that provides for the purchasing of silver bullion at its market rates—four and a half millions per month—and the issuance of certificates upon the bullion, redeemable in coin, or in silver bullion, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. I had occasion, Mr. Speaker, to allude to this bill when it was being considered before, and to call attention to the fact that it was a departure from all past history with regard to the use of gold and silver as money in this country. I called attention to the fact that under the Constitution Congress was given the sole power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof and of foreign coins; that no state could make anything but gold and silver a legal tender in the payment of debts. It was contemplated by the framers of the Constitution that Congress should coin the money, gold and silver. But this bill, if enacted into a law, makes silver bullion not a subject for coinage, except that part of it

which, it is claimed, may be necessary to redeem the notes. But it also provides that the notes may be redeemed in the bullion itself on deposit, and thus afford an opportunity of expanding or contracting the currency of the country at the will of the "speculators" the gentleman from Iowa a moment ago alluded to. Now, if there have been organized combinations or syndicates of individuals for the purpose of speculating in silver bullion, having that object in view, it must have been in contemplation of the passage of this House bill, because that opened the doors to the widest speculation in silver bullion. To-day, for instance, you may have $10,000,000 of bullion under this bill in the treasury, to-morrow not $1,000,000—not a dollar, not a cent. You put silver bullion into the treasury at one door and issue notes upon it, and then go right straight to the next door and take the whole of it out. You may have $100,000,000 in the treasury four or five years from now, and under the bill, in the discretion of the Secretary of the treasury (to enable the speculators to speculate and realize fortunes in silver bullion) you may turn it out daily to the amount of $50,000,000, until it is all gone, if he sees proper. So the bill as it passed the House was an invitation to the formation of these syndicates, and gentlemen who desire to speculate in silver bullion; and the doors would have been open wide if the Senate had agreed to the House bill.

But there are other objections to it, Mr. Speaker. As I stated before, it is a departure from all the traditions, from all the principles, of bimetalism. It measures silver by gold, and gold only, in the purchase of the bullion. It measures the amount of certificates that may be in circulation upon the gold value of the bullion. In other words, there can be no bimetalism under that system. The bill provides that the notes, when issued, shall not exceed in circulation the cost of the bullion, or, in other words, that you will not be permitted to have in circulation in this country the coinage value of the bullion, but only its gold value. Thus, practically, you fix the market rate of the two metals as the ratio of issuing money, instead of that established by law fixing the legal ratio as we have it to-day at sixteen to one. Now, if the bill provided that the bullion should be purchased at its market rate, and that the

notes outstanding should not be less than the market rates of the bullion on hand, nor exceeding the coinage value, you would then keep up the legal ratio. The Secretary of the Treasury would have some discretion, possibly, but you would have the power to issue notes up to the coining value of the bullion; whereas, under this bill the Secretary of the Treasury is absolutely prohibited from keeping in circulation a dollar in notes beyond the gold value of the bullion deposited. Now, in that I say we establish a new ratio of issuing money on silver. We depart from the ratio of sixteen to one entirely. We issue notes upon the silver bullion at the gold value of the bullion, and not upon its coining value. Now, the present law—and I want to call gentlemen's attention particularly to that, because it is an important part of the discussion of this bill—the present law provides for the purchase of the bullion, but it also compels the coinage of that bullion into standard dollars of 412½ grains, which are a legal tender, and on this coin a note is issued, so that under the present law we have a circulation equal to the coining value of all the bullion purchased. In other words, we maintain the ratio between the two metals, that ratio being sixteen to one (or 15.98 more correctly speaking), and in the issuing of the money and putting it in circulation we recognize that legal ratio between gold and silver, and maintain it. Under this bullion bill, that is the House bill, we depart from it, and we not only purchase the bullion at its market rate, but we prohibit the issuing of money upon it except at its gold value, thus permanently fixing for this country the gold standard, and the gold standard alone, whereas the present law is a modification of the gold standard. It is a modification of the gold standard in so far as we issue silver and put it in circulation at a fixed ratio of sixteen to one, and every silver dollar that is a legal tender for every debt, public and private, at the ratio of sixteen to one, comes into competition with the gold dollar, and to that extent competes with the gold dollar and maintains the ratio between the two. But this House bill, and all the bullion propositions that I have seen yet, depart from that ratio, an important matter to be considered by this House, and one that must be considered by the Senate if we undertake to get up a con-

ference committee. It is an important matter for those in favor of silver, whether you deposit bullion and issue notes upon it, or whether you coin the money, that you maintain the ratio, and insist upon the right and power of the government to issue notes equal to the coining value of the bullion on deposit.

What I claim is, that if we are to have the limited coinage of silver, if we are to have this House bill agreed to by a committee of conference, which provides for the purchase of $4,500,000 worth of silver bullion every month, and the issue of $4,500,000 in notes on the bullion so purchased, and purchased at its gold value, and the notes issued at its gold value—I say, after it is purchased, we ought to insist upon the right and power, and we ought to give the power to the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue beyond that; not to the bullion holder, because the government when it purchases the bullion owns it, and has paid for it at its gold value, at its cost; but after the bullion is paid for and is the property of the government we ought, to keep up the ratio, to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to increase the notes to the coining value of the bullion.

You understand the proposition. I say we get the benefit of the seigniorage now, because we purchase bullion and coin it into 412½-grain dollars, and the notes are issued upon this coin, and in that way the government and the people get the benefit of the seigniorage. In other words, $2,000,000 of silver bullion, if silver is worth seventy-two cents, will coin $2,280,000. That is to say, the Secretary of the Treasury purchases $2,000,000 worth of bullion, and that $2,000,000 worth of bullion yields a circulation of $2,280,000. That is the gain, and that gain goes into circulation under the present law. Four million dollars worth of bullion each month, coined into standard money, will put into circulation about $60,000,000 per year. That is, $48,000,000 worth of silver bullion will coin about 60,000,000 standard dollars, or more than this bill will put into circulation in its present state. In other words, we get the benefit of the seigniorage; so we get the difference between the cost value and the coining value. And it is important to keep up that as a principle, not only in order to gain the benefit of that outside circulation, but in order that we may

not here establish a precedent; because this bill will establish this precedent, if it is enacted into a law, that we have abandoned the ratio of sixteen to one in issuing money on silver; that we have established a new relation and a new ratio; that we have established its gold value as the ratio, whatever that may be, for the notes outstanding; and when contracts are based upon it, years hence, when we want free coinage and come before Congress demanding it, it will be claimed that you have established here a market ratio between gold and silver that all contracts are resting upon, and that you cannot now go back to the ratio of sixteen to one.

It will be claimed that it will be unjust to creditors, that debtors would have the advantage, and it would be unjust to go back to the ratio of sixteen to one in issuing money. Hence, I say, it is an important matter, if this bill is to become a law, that gentlemen watch that point, that we do not depart from our ratio, and although you may put in your bill that the notes outstanding shall not be less than the cost of the bullion, let it further provide that the issue may be to the limit of the coining value after the government has purchased the bullion. Then, if we should have a deficit in the Treasury department and we want more money issued on that bullion, you have the power to do it. Reserve that power in the bill to increase the notes to the amount of the coining value of the bullion, and do not depart from that, but insist upon it. Now, I say, after the government has purchased the bullion at its cost, and the notes are issued for its purchase, it shall then reserve the power and right in the Secretary of the Treasury to issue on it notes equal to its coin value, and the government gets the benefit of the difference between the bullion value and the dollar. I say that we propose that point, first, because it is necessary, so that we keep up the ratio of the two metals and not permit gold to be the whole measure, as it is being made by this bill; not to establish the gold standard entirely, and use silver only as a commodity, and as having no part or parcel in the measure of the circulation of the country.

That is the House bill, and therefore I insist that this changes the ratio of issuing money upon silver. Instead of

making the legal ratio of 16½ to 1, it is establishing a market ratio on which money shall be issued, changing the whole theory of our coinage and changing the ratio of 16½ to 1 to the market ratio, which to-day is 22 to 1. In other words, this bill proposes to change the ratio from 16 to 1 to 22 to 1 in issuing money on silver.

Now, I say if the bill is so amended that after the bullion is purchased notes issue at its market price, but after it is purchased giving the power to the Secretary of the Treasury to authorize the further issue of the amount of the difference between the market value and the coin value of the bullion, then, I say to you, we get the benefit of the profit or seigniorage; for certainly no one will claim that it is not safe to issue money on silver bullion when it has behind it, dollar for dollar, the coin value of the bullion, and I am claiming and demonstrating that that is safe enough. We have a currency based, dollar for dollar, on the 412½ grains of silver, with a paper dollar note behind it. It is safe. Do we want to depart from that and issue notes and say notes shall not be outstanding in greater amount than the actual value of the bullion?

Of course, every gentleman understands that I have been arguing all the while that the only proper way of settling this question is by free coinage, and I wish to do whatever is in my power to secure that. If it is impossible to get that, and we can get this with two amendments, I will vote for it. These particular amendments are simply this: First, that the notes outstanding shall not be less than the cost price of the bullion, and not exceeding its coin value. Second, in order to keep up the coinage, that the notes shall be redeemed in coin, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin, if necessary, for its redemption, no less in amount than $2,000,000 per month.

In other words, let coinage go on. Do not stop that. Now, gentlemen, I insist upon that. It is an important matter. I object to continuing piling up and piling up bullion in the Treasury without ever coining it; for it will not be coined. You will set a precedent that will come home to trouble you. It will be a boomerang. I insist upon coining this money, and there ought to be coined not less than $2,000,000 per month; and if you cannot get that,

get $1,000,000. It is an important point that you must have it coined. Take from the note the legal-tender feature, and probably there will not be presented for redemption one million, probably not half a million; and if they are not presented for redemption, there will be no coinage. There will be no coinage in any event. Mark that. And I will tell you why. You have about 200,000,000 of standard silver dollars already coined, and on them you have notes outstanding almost equal to the amount of coined dollars, except the dollars in circulation—probably 56,000,000 or 58,000,000.

There is nothing in this bill, or in the present law, to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury from canceling the present silver certificates to whatever amount he sees proper. The law simply provides that they may be reissued. When these certificates come in for the payment of taxes, they are canceled or reissued, at the pleasure of the secretary, and he will simply cancel a sufficient number of the certificates, and will leave the resulting coin for the redemption of legal-tender notes. I see nothing at all to prevent it, and we know that the present Secretary of the Treasury has already stated, as all secretaries preceding him have stated, that we ought not to coin another dollar; so that not another dollar will be coined under this bill unless there is compulsion in it, because the coin on hand will answer all these purposes. The notes outstanding will be canceled for that purpose. The 8,000,000, 10,000,000, 15,000,000, or 20,000,000 of silver dollars already coined will be kept on hand for the redemption of the notes, and you cannot get another dollar coined under this bill.

Our national banks are insisting upon maintaining their legal status by a small issue of circulating notes, and they are desirous of reducing their circulation and having a system that will permit them to exist with as small a circulation as possible, keeping within the purview of the law. On the same principle the friends of silver ought to insist on the continued coinage of silver in order to keep it within the purview of the law and the Constitution; for, mark you, unless silver bullion is coined, if it is simply bought as a commodity, and put into the treasury simply as a commodity, as it would be under this bill, you will have it said,

and said truly, by the people, that you have as much right to put iron there, that you have as much right to put lead there, that you have as much right to put zinc there, that you have as much right to put wheat there, as you have to put silver bullion; and you have the same right, and you cannot answer the argument. But, on the other hand, if the mints of the government are continually coining this silver bullion into money, the case will be entirely different. That is what the Constitution contemplates. It contemplates silver as money, because it can be coined. Cotton cannot be coined, neither can lead, nor zinc, nor any other commodity, and therefore they are not money; but, under the Constitution of our country, we can legally make money out of silver bullion, and silver is good as bullion in the treasury simply because your mints are open to its coinage, and when you stop that the principle is abandoned.

We have the free coinage of gold. There can be no objection to issuing notes on gold at its coinage value. You do not take its bullion value, but you take its coin value at the mints, and you can issue notes upon it. Why? Because if I have a gold note I can take it to the treasury, if I wish to do so, and take out the gold bullion, and go to the mint and have it coined into money. I do not care whether a piece of gold is bullion or coin in the treasury; in fact it is money, and the miner who extracts gold from the earth does not extract a product, a commodity, but he extracts dollars and cents, because he can take the gold to the mints of the country anywhere and have it turned into money. So as to silver bullion, when you give it free coinage at your mints; then the party can deposit his bullion, or he can have it coined. It is no longer a commodity, because it is monetized. The free coinage of silver has the same effect as the free coinage of gold. It monetizes the metal, and all the government does is to put a die upon it to show what the coin is. Whether in bullion or in coin, such a metal is worth precisely what it will coin, neither more nor less.

The moment you provide for the free coinage of silver it is no longer a commodity; it is monetized. Why? Because every man who has got 412 grains of silver will refuse to take one cent less than a dollar for it, knowing that he

can take it to the mint and have it coined into a dollar. That fixes a price below which it cannot fall; but when silver is not monetized, when it is a commodity, as this bill makes it, the case is different. You pile it up in the treasury as a commodity, and when you take it out by a note, you cannot go and have that silver coined; it is a mere commodity. On the other hand, when you take out a piece of gold bullion with a note, you can take it directly to the mint and have it coined. There is a vast difference between a metal that is monetized and one that is demonetized. Silver is now demonetized. It is now a commodity and when you issue notes upon it, you issue notes upo a commodity.

Unless you have some compulsory coinage of that bullion you cannot maintain the proposition that it is better as a basis for coinage than wheat, except that it is not perishable, or any better than lead or zinc, which are not perishable. You cannot coin lead or iron or zinc, nor can you coin the silver that is piled up in the treasury department unless you authorize it by law.

Hence I claim that it is a matter of great importance to the friends of silver, to those who are in favor of the true theory of money in this country, to insist that silver shall have the right of coinage to some extent, however limited it may be, so as to contradistinguish it from commodities. That is what I mean. When you say that silver bullion shall not be coined, that practically no coin shall be issued upon it, but it shall be placed in the treasury and notes issued upon it, you treat it as a commodity; it is no more entitled to coinage than iron or zinc or any other metal.

By such measures you demonetize silver; you make a commodity of it. When you, gentlemen on the other side, go home to your constituents and undertake to explain this point, and tell them why you provided for the deposit of silver bullion and the issue of treasury notes upon it, and why you would not treat cotton or wheat or lead or iron in the same way, you cannot explain your position. But if you say to your constituents, "We have put bullion in the treasury, it is true, but we have compelled the Secretary of the Treasury to coin it under the Constitution," however limited the coinage may be, you then draw

the distinction between silver bullion and other commodities. You then point to the Constitution of the country, which makes silver money; you point to the law which recognizes it as money at a fixed ratio of coinage; you keep up the ratio as well as the coinage. Thus you educate the people of this country in the true theory of monetary science. But when you undertake to select any particular commodity on which to issue notes without coinage, you are departing from all the theories of bimetalism, and you are giving silver a stab in this very bill which is claimed to be friendly to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope this free-coinage bill will not be voted down. I trust this House will do what the Forty-fifth Congress seemed to be unable to do, and that is, grapple with this great question. The longer we postpone it the greater becomes the difficulty. It was postponed in 1878, and a provision was put into the bill asking a conference of foreign governments for the purpose of coming to some agreement on the subject, and some understanding by which France, England, and Germany may open their mints to the free coinage of silver. We were told then—that was the prediction that defeated free silver then—that we could have this agreement which was promised us. But instead of that, we were met, especially by England and by Germany, with an absolute refusal even to consider the question.

If we have free coinage of silver now we are in this position: We are in the position to control the metals of this country in our own interests. Instead of London being the great center where you find gold and silver exchanged, and instead of England controlling the value of the two metals, New York will become the exchange of the world as between gold and silver. France that occupied that position for over seventy years, with the coinage between the two metals at a fixed ratio of 15½ to 1, was the clearing-house of the world for the money metals, and has to-day more metallic money within its borders than any country in the world, this country not excepted. There you could go and exchange your gold for silver and silver for gold at a fixed ratio of 15½ to 1; and if we had that ratio and free coinage here to-day, this country would

simply be the clearing-house of the world upon the metallic question, and would stand in the position of controlling the value of gold and the value of silver, as established by law for the whole world. Because, Mr. Speaker, having, as we do, the South American countries, and China, and India, constituting over five-sevenths, or about that number, of the people of this world using silver, and the other part using gold, we would simply be the clearing-house for the gold-using and the silver-using countries of the world, and stand in the position of masters of the situation, instead of being, as we are to-day, simply a tail to the London kite.

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE

ADDRESSES TO HIS ARMY

[Napoleon Bonaparte was born at Ajaccio, 1769. He entered the military school at Brienne on April 23, 1779, leaving that institution in 1784 for a military academy in Paris. In 1793 he was placed in command of a battalion of artillery, and for his success at Toulon was made general of brigade. Under Barras, in command of the garrison of Paris, he swept the city with grape-shot, overwhelming the Terrorists and bringing to an end the French Revolution October 5, 1794. In 1796 he married Josephine de Beauharnais, née Tasher, having been appointed on the same day to the command of the army in Italy. The coup d'état, November 9, 1799, placed Napoleon in power as First Consul. During the consulate he made many reforms. He stopped the persecution of the priests, opened the churches, changed the system of internal government, framed the code, aided education, reestablished the ecclesiastical hierarchy, instituted the Legion of Honor, and arranged the financial system of the country on a proper basis. War was renewed over Malta. Obliged to give up the invasion of England he attacked the Austrians, and on December 2, 1805, the Austro-Russian army was defeated at Austerlitz. At Trafalgar Nelson annihilated Napoleon's still cherished plan of invading England. The Peninsular war resulted disastrously, and the French were driven across the Pyrenees in 1814. After divorce from Josephine his marriage with Marie Louise took place, and the King of Rome was born March 20, 1811. The Russian invasion and defeat exhausted the army by the loss of half a million men, and prepared the way for Elba and Waterloo. The battle of Leipsic was the beginning of the end, and the few following victories did not prevent the allies from marching on Paris and taking possession of it. The emperor was forced to abdicate April 4, 1814, and was banished to Elba. After an interval of ten months, during which he laid crafty plots, he escaped from the island of Elba, in 1815, and appealed again to France. He succeeded in driving out Louis XVIII., and again took the field against the allies. Waterloo was lost June 18, 1815, and Napoleon was held as a prisoner at St. Helena by the British until his death, May 5, 1821. His body was removed to Paris in 1840.]

ADDRESS TO HIS ARMY AT BEGINNING OF ITALIAN CAMPAIGN

SOLDIERS: You are naked and ill-fed! Government owes you much and can give you nothing. The patience and courage you have shown in the midst of this rocky wilderness are admirable; but they gain you no renown; no glory results to you from your endurance. It is my design to lead you into the most fertile plains of the world. Rich provinces and great cities will be in your power; there you will find honor, glory, and wealth. Soldiers of Italy, will you be wanting in courage or perseverance?

PROCLAMATION TO HIS ARMY

Soldiers: You have in fifteen days gained six victories, taken twenty-one stand of colors, fifty-five pieces of cannon, and several fortresses, and overrun the richest part of Piedmont; you have made 15,000 prisoners and killed or wounded upward of 10,000 men.

Hitherto you have been fighting for barren rocks, made memorable by your valor, though useless to your country, but your exploits now equal those of the armies of Holland and the Rhine. You were utterly destitute, and you have supplied all your wants. You have gained battles without cannon, passed rivers without bridges, performed forced marches without shoes; and bivouacked without strong liquors, and often without bread.

None but republican phalanxes, the soldiers of liberty, could have endured what you have done; thanks to you, soldiers, for your perseverance! Your grateful country owes its safety to you; and if the taking of Toulon was an earnest of the immortal campaign of 1794, your present victories foretell one more glorious.

The two armies which lately attacked you in full confidence now flee before you in consternation; the perverse men who laughed at your distress and inwardly rejoiced at the triumph of your enemies are now confounded and trembling.

But, soldiers, you have as yet done nothing, for there still remains much to do. Neither Turin nor Milan is yours; the ashes of the conquerors of Tonquin are still trodden under foot by the assassins of Basseville. It is said that there are some among you whose courage is shaken, and who would prefer returning to the summits of the Alps and Apennines. No, I cannot believe it. The victors of Montenotte, Millesimo, Dego, and Mondovi are eager to extend the glory of the French name!

TO SOLDIERS ON ENTERING MILAN

Soldiers: You have rushed like a torrent from the top of the Apennines; you have overthrown and scattered all that opposed your march. Piedmont, delivered from Austrian tyranny, indulges her natural sentiments of peace and friendship toward France. Milan is yours, and the republican flag waves throughout Lombardy. The dukes of Parma and Modena owe their political existence to your generosity alone.

The army which so proudly threatened you can find no barrier to protect it against your courage; neither the Po, the Ticino, nor the Adda could stop you for a single day. These vaunted bulwarks of Italy opposed you in vain; you passed them as rapidly as the Apennines.

These great successes have filled the heart of your country with joy. Your representatives have ordered a festival to commemorate your victories, which has been held in every district of the republic. There your fathers, your mothers, your wives, sisters, and mistresses rejoiced in your good fortune and proudly boasted of belonging to you.

Yes, soldiers, you have done much—but remains there nothing more to do? Shall it be said of us that we knew how to conquer, but not how to make use of victory? Shall posterity reproach us with having found Capua in Lombardy?

But I see you already hasten to arms. An effeminate repose is tedious to you; the days which are lost to glory are lost to your happiness. Well, then, let us set forth!

We have still forced marches to make, enemies to subdue, laurels to gather, injuries to revenge. Let those who have sharpened the daggers of civil war in France, who have basely murdered our ministers and burnt our ships at Toulon, tremble!

The hour of vengeance has struck; but let the people of all countries be free from apprehension; we are the friends of the people everywhere, and those great men whom we have taken for our models. To restore the Capitol, to replace the statues of the heroes who rendered it illustrious, to rouse the Roman people, stupefied by several ages of slavery—such will be the fruit of our victories; they will form an era for posterity; you will have the immortal glory of changing the face of the finest part of Europe. The French people, free and respected by the whole world, will give to Europe a glorious peace, which will indemnify them for the sacrifices of every kind which for the last six years they have been making. You will then return to your homes and your country. Men will say, as they point you out, "He belonged to the army of Italy."

ADDRESS TO TROOPS ON CONCLUSION OF FIRST ITALIAN CAMPAIGN

Soldiers: The campaign just ended has given you imperishable renown. You have been victorious in fourteen pitched battles and seventy actions. You have taken more than a hundred thousand prisoners, five hundred field-pieces, two thousand heavy guns, and four pontoon trains. You have maintained the army during the whole campaign. In addition to this you have sent six millions of dollars to the public treasury, and have enriched the National Museum with three hundred masterpieces of the arts of ancient and modern Italy, which it has required thirty centuries to produce. You have conquered the finest countries in Europe.

The French flag waves for the first time upon the Adriatic opposite to Macedon, the native country of Alexander. Still higher destinies await you. I know that you will not prove unworthy of them. Of all the foes that conspired to stifle the republic in its birth, the Austrian emperor alone

remains before you. To obtain peace we must seek it in the heart of his hereditary state. You will find there a brave people, whose religion and customs you will respect, and whose prosperity you will hold sacred. Remember that it is liberty you carry to the great Hungarian nation.

ADDRESS TO SOLDIERS DURING SIEGE OF MANTUA

Soldiers: I am not satisfied with you; you have shown neither bravery, discipline, nor perseverance; no position could rally you; you abandoned yourselves to a panic terror; you suffered yourselves to be driven from situations where a handful of brave men might have stopped an army. Soldiers of the Thirty-ninth and Eighty-fifth, you are not French soldiers. Quartermaster-General, let it be inscribed on their colors, "They no longer form part of the army of Italy."

ADDRESS TO TROOPS AFTER WAR OF THIRD COALITION

Soldiers of the Grand Army: In a fortnight we have finished the entire campaign. What we proposed to do has been done. We have driven the Austrian troops from Bavaria and restored our ally to the sovereignty of his dominions.

That army which with equal presumption and imprudence marched upon our frontiers is annihilated.

But what does this signify to England? She has gained her object. We are no longer at Boulogne, and her subsidy will be neither more nor less.

Of a hundred thousand men who composed that army sixty thousand are prisoners. They will replace our conscripts in the labors of agriculture.

Two hundred pieces of cannon, the whole park of artillery, ninety flags, and all their generals are in our power. Fifteen thousand men only have escaped.

Soldiers: I announced to you the result of a great battle; but, thanks to the ill-advised schemes of the enemy, I was enabled to secure the wished-for result without incurring any danger, and, what is unexampled in the history of nations, that result has been gained at the sacrifice of scarcely fifteen hundred men killed and wounded.

Soldiers: This success is due to your unlimited confidence in your emperor, to your patience in enduring fatigues and privations of every kind, and to your singular courage and intrepidity.

But we will not stop here. You are impatient to commence another campaign.

The Russian army, which English gold has brought from the extremities of the universe, shall experience the same fate as that which we have just defeated.

In the conflict in which we are about to engage, the honor of the French infantry is especially concerned. We shall now see another decision of the question which has already been determined in Switzerland and Holland, namely, whether the French infantry is the first or the second in Europe.

Among the Russians there are no generals in contending against whom I can acquire any glory. All I wish is to obtain the victory with the least possible bloodshed. My soldiers are my children.

ADDRESS TO TROOPS ON BEGINNING THE RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN

Soldiers: The second war of Poland has begun. The first war terminated at Friedland and Tilsit. At Tilsit Russia swore eternal alliance with France and war with England. She has openly violated her oath, and refuses to offer any explanation of her strange conduct till the French eagle shall have passed the Rhine, and consequently shall have left her allies at her discretion. Russia is impelled onward by fatality. Her destiny is about to be accomplished. Does she believe that we have degenerated—that we are no longer the soldiers of Austerlitz? She has placed

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE

Photogravure after an engraving



us between dishonor and war. The choice cannot for an instant be doubtful.

Let us march forward, then, and, crossing the Niemen, carry the war into her territories. The second war of Poland will be to the French army as glorious as the first. But our next peace must carry with it its own guaranty and put an end to that arrogant influence which for the last fifty years Russia has exercised over the affairs of Europe.

FAREWELL TO THE OLD GUARD

Soldiers of my Old Guard: I bid you farewell. For twenty years I have constantly accompanied you on the road to honor and glory. In these latter times, as in the days of our prosperity, you have invariably been models of courage and fidelity. With men such as you our cause could not be lost; but the war would have been interminable; it would have been civil war, and that would have entailed deeper misfortunes on France.

I have sacrificed all my interests to those of the country.

I go, but you, my friends, will continue to serve France. Her happiness was my only thought. It will still be the object of my wishes. Do not regret my fate; if I have consented to survive, it is to serve your glory. I intend to write the history of the great achievements we have performed together. Adieu, my friends. Would I could press you all to my heart.

. . . . . .

[Napoleon then ordered the eagles to be brought, and, having embraced them he added:]—

I embrace you all in the person of your general. Adieu, soldiers. Be always gallant and good.

JOHN CABELL BRECKINRIDGE

ADDRESS PRECEDING REMOVAL OF SENATE

[John Cabell Breckinridge, an American soldier and statesman, who spoke in public with much effect, was born in Kentucky in 1821. He was engaged in the practice of law in his native state when elected to Congress. Later he was Vice-President of the United States, and in 1860 was made the Presidential candidate of the southern wing of the Democratic party, carrying a number of states. When the Civil War came he had been chosen to the United States Senate, but he went into the Confederacy and rose to high command in the Southern army. He was also for a time the Confederate Secretary of War. He died in 1875. The occasion on which the following speech was delivered, in 1858, was the last gathering of the United States Senate in the old senate chamber.]

ON the sixth of December 1819 the Senate assembled for the first time in this chamber, which has been the theater of their deliberations for more than thirty-nine years.

And now the strife and uncertainties of the past are finished. We see around us on every side the proofs of stability and improvement. The capitol is worthy of the republic. Noble public buildings meet the view on every hand. Treasures of science and the arts begin to accumulate. As this flourishing city enlarges it testifies to the wisdom and forecast that dictated the plan of it. Future generations will not be disturbed with questions concerning the center of population, or of territory, since the steamboat, the railroad, and the telegraph have made communication almost instantaneous. The spot is sacred by a thousand memories, which are so many pledges that the city of Washington, founded by him and bearing his revered name, with its beautiful site, bounded by picturesque eminences, and the broad Potomac, and lying within view

of his home and his tomb, shall remain forever the political capital of the United States.

It would be interesting to note the gradual changes which have occurred in the practical working of the government since the adoption of the Constitution; and it may be appropriate to this occasion to remark one of the most striking of them.

At the origin of the government the Senate seemed to be regarded chiefly as an executive council. The President often visited the chamber and conferred personally with this body; most of its business was transacted with closed doors, and it took comparatively little part in the legislative debates. The rising and vigorous intellects of the country sought the arena of the House of Representatives as the appropriate theater for the display of their powers. Mr. Madison observed, on some occasion, that being a young man and desiring to increase his reputation, he could not afford to enter the Senate; and it will be remembered that so late as 1812 the great debates which preceded the war and aroused the country to the assertion of its rights took place in the other branch of Congress. To such an extent was the idea of seclusion carried that when this chamber was completed no seats were prepared for the accommodation of the public; and it was not until many years afterward that the semi-circular gallery was erected which admits the people to be witnesses of your proceedings. But now, the Senate, besides its peculiar relations to the executive department of the government, assumes its full share of duty as a co-equal branch of the legislature; indeed, from the limited number of its members and for other obvious reasons the most important questions, especially of foreign policy, are apt to pass first under discussion in this body, and to be a member of it is justly regarded as one of the highest honors which can be conferred on an American statesman.

It is scarcely necessary to point out the causes of this change, or to say that it is a concession both to the importance and to the individuality of the states, and to the free and open character of the government.

In connection with this easy but thorough transition, it is worthy of remark that it has been effected without a

charge from any quarter that the Senate has transcended its constitutional sphere—a tribute at once to the moderation of the Senate, and another proof to thoughtful men of the comprehensive wisdom with which the framers of the Constitution secured essential principles without inconveniently embarrassing the action of the government.

The progress of this popular movement in one aspect of it has been steady and marked. At the origin of the government, no arrangements in the Senate were made for spectators; in this chamber about one-third of the space is allotted to the public; and in the new apartment the galleries cover two-thirds of its area. In all free countries the admission of the people to witness legislative proceedings is an essential element of public confidence; and it is not to be anticipated that this wholesome principle will ever be abused by the substitution of partial and interested demonstrations for the expression of a matured and enlightened public opinion. Yet it should never be forgotten that not France, but the turbulent spectators within the hall, awed and controlled the French Assembly. With this lesson and its consequences before us, the time will never come when the deliberations of the Senate shall be swayed by the blandishments or the thunders of the galleries.

It is impossible to disconnect from an occasion like this a crowd of reflections on our past history and of speculations on the future. The most meager account of the Senate involves a summary of the progress of our country. From year to year you have seen your representation enlarge; again and again you have proudly welcomed a new sister into the confederacy; and the occurrences of this day are a material and impressive proof of the growth and prosperity of the United States. Three periods in the history of the Senate mark in striking contrast three epochs in the history of the Union.

On the third of March, 1789, when the government was organized under the Constitution, the Senate was composed of the representatives of eleven states, containing three millions of people.

On the sixth of December, 1819, when the Senate met for the first time in this room, it was composed of the representatives of twenty-one states, containing nine millions of people.

To-day it is composed of the representatives of thirty-two states, containing more than twenty-eight millions of people, prosperous, happy, and still devoted to constitutional liberty. Let these great facts speak for themselves to all the world.

The career of the United States cannot be measured by that of any other people of whom history gives account; and the mind is almost appalled at the contemplation of the prodigious force which has marked their progress. Sixty-nine years ago thirteen states, containing three millions of inhabitants, burdened with debt, and exhausted by the long war of independence, established for their common good a free constitution on principles new to mankind, and began their experiment with the good wishes of a few doubting friends and the derision of the world. Look at the result to-day: twenty-eight millions of people, in every way happier than an equal number in any other part of the globe; the center of population and political power descending the western slopes of the Alleghany Mountains, and the original thirteen states forming but the eastern margin on the map of our vast possessions.

See besides, Christianity, civilization, and the arts given to a continent; the despised colonies grown into a power of the first class, representing and protecting ideas that involve the progress of the human race; a commerce greater than that of any other nation; free interchange between states; every variety of climate, soil, and production, to make a people powerful and happy—in a word, behold present greatness, and in the future an empire to which the ancient mistress of the world in the height of her glory could not be compared. Such is our country; aye, and more—far more than my mind could conceive or my tongue could utter. Is there an American who regrets the past? Is there one who will deride his country's laws, pervert her Constitution, or alienate her people? If there be such a man, let his memory descend to posterity laden with the execrations of all mankind.

So happy is the political and social condition of the United States, and so accustomed are we to the secure enjoyment of a freedom elsewhere unknown, that we are apt to undervalue the treasures we possess, and to lose in some

degree the sense of obligation to our forefathers. But when the strifes of faction shake the government, and even threaten it, we may pause with advantage long enough to remember that we are reaping the reward of other men's labors. This liberty we inherit; this admirable Constitution, which has survived peace and war, prosperity and adversity, this double scheme of government, state and federal, so peculiar and so little understood by other powers, yet which protects the earnings of industry and makes the largest personal freedom compatible with public order—these great results were not achieved without wisdom and toil and blood; the touching and heroic record is before the world. But to all this we were born, and, like heirs upon whom has been cast a great inheritance, have only the high duty to preserve, to extend, and to adorn it. The grand productions of the era in which the foundations of this government were laid, reveal the deep sense its founders had of their obligations to the whole family of man. Let us never forget that the responsibilities imposed on this generation are by so much the greater than those which rested on our revolutionary ancestors, as the population, extent, and power of our country surpass the dawning promise of its origin.

It would be a pleasing task to pursue many trains of thought, not wholly foreign to this occasion, but the temptation to enter the wide field must be rigorously curbed; yet I may be pardoned, perhaps, for one or two additional reflections.

The Senate is assembled for the last time in this chamber. Henceforth it will be converted to other uses; yet it must remain forever connected with great events, and sacred to the memories of the departed orators and statesmen who here engaged in high debates and shaped the policy of their country. Hereafter the American and the stranger, as they wander through the capitol, will turn with instinctive reverence to view the spot on which so many and great materials have accumulated for history. They will recall the images of the great and the good, whose renown is the common property of the Union; and, chiefly, perhaps, they will linger around the seats once occupied by the mighty three, whose names and fame, associated in life, death has

not been able to sever; illustrious men, who in their generation sometimes divided, sometimes led, and sometimes resisted public opinion—for they were of that higher class of statesmen who seek the right and follow their convictions.

There sat Calhoun, the senator, inflexible, austere, oppressed, but not overwhelmed by his deep sense of the importance of his public functions; seeking the truth, then fearlessly following it—a man whose unsparing intellect compelled all his emotions to harmonize with the deductions of his rigorous logic, and whose noble countenance habitually wore the expression of one engaged in the performance of high public duties.

This was Webster's seat. He, too, was every inch a senator. Conscious of his own vast powers, he reposed with confidence on himself; and scorning the contrivances of smaller men, he stood among his peers all the greater for the simple dignity of his senatorial demeanor. Type of his northern home, he rises before the imagination, in the grand and granite outline of his form and intellect, like a great New England rock, repelling a New England wave. As a writer, his productions will be cherished by statesmen and scholars while the English tongue is spoken. As a senatorial orator, his great efforts are historically associated with this chamber, whose very air seems to vibrate beneath the strokes of his deep tones and his weighty words.

On the outer circle sat Henry Clay, with his impetuous and ardent nature untamed by age, and exhibiting in the Senate the same vehement patriotism and passionate eloquence that of yore electrified the House of Representatives and the country. His extraordinary personal endowments, his courage, all his noble qualities, invested him with an individuality and a charm of character which in any age would have made him a favorite of history. He loved his country above all earthly objects. He loved liberty in all countries. Illustrious man!—orator, patriot, philanthropist—whose light, at its meridian, was seen and felt in the remotest parts of the civilized world; and whose declining sun, as it hastened down the west, threw back its level beams in hues of mellowed splendor, to illuminate and to cheer the land he loved and served so well.

And now, senators, we leave this memorable chamber,

bearing with us unimpaired the Constitution we received from our forefathers. Let us cherish it with grateful acknowledgments to the Divine Power who controls the destinies of empires and whose goodness we adore. The structures reared by men yield to the corroding tooth of time. These marble walls must molder into ruin; but the principles of constitutional liberty, guarded by wisdom and virtue, unlike material elements, do not decay. Let us devoutly trust that another Senate, in another age, shall bear to a new and larger chamber this Constitution, vigorous and inviolate, and that the last generation of posterity shall witness the deliberations of the representatives of American states still united, prosperous, and free.

JOHN BRIGHT

THE "TRENT" AFFAIR

[John Bright, an English orator and statesman, was born in Rochdale in 1811. He was the son of a Quaker cotton-spinner in prosperous circumstances. He early showed aptitude for business affairs, but his chief interest was in public questions. The opinions he formed were always of an advanced liberal kind, their first conspicuous assertion occurring when the Anti-Corn-Law League was formed by Cobden in 1839. Bright's speeches drew instant attention to him. He proclaimed himself a free-trader and a friend of the working classes, and was elected to parliament in 1843, being reëlected, with the exception of one defeat, until the close of his career. He advocated a peaceful foreign policy, suffrage extension, and the series of economic ideas known as those of the Manchester School. One of the great displays of his eloquence was made during the American Civil War. He was an ardent friend of the Northern cause at a time when English public men seemed to have given their sympathies to the South. He stemmed the tide that had set in against the Union, and brought his countrymen around to his way of thinking. He sat twice in a Gladstone cabinet, but he could not accept the Home Rule bill. He died in 1889. The following speech was delivered at Rochdale in 1861, and was occasioned by the action of Captain Wilkes, of the United States Navy, in arresting Mason and Slidell, Confederate commissioners to England and France, who were on board the British steamer "Trent," in 1861.]

WHEN the gentlemen who invited me to this dinner called upon me, I felt their kindness very sensibly, and now I am deeply grateful to my friends around me, and to you all, for the abundant manifestations of kindness with which I have been received to-night. I am, as you all know, surrounded at this moment by my neighbors and friends, and I may say with the utmost truth that I value the good opinions of those who now hear my voice far beyond the opinions of any equal number of the inhabitants of this country selected from any other portion of it. You have,

by this act of kindness that you have shown me, given proof that, in the main, you do not disapprove of my course and labors, that at least you are willing to express an opinion that the motives by which I have been actuated have been honest and honorable to myself, and that that course has not been entirely without service to my country. Coming to this meeting, or to any similar meeting, I always find that the subjects for discussion appear too many, and far more than it is possible to treat at length. In these times in which we live, by the influence of the telegraph, and the steamboat, and the railroad, and the multiplication of newspapers, we seem continually to stand as on the top of an exceeding high mountain, from which we behold all the kingdoms of the earth and all the glory of them—unhappily, also, not only their glory, but their follies, and their crimes, and their calamities.

Seven years ago, our eyes were turned with anxious expectation to a remote corner of Europe, where five nations were contending in bloody strife for an object which possibly hardly one of them comprehended, and, if they did comprehend it, which all sensible men among them must have known to be absolutely impracticable. Four years ago we were looking still farther to the East, where there was a gigantic revolt in a great dependency of the British crown, arising mainly from gross neglect, and from the incapacity of England, up to that moment, to govern the country which it had known how to conquer. Two years ago we looked south, to the plains of Lombardy, and saw a great strife there, in which every man in England took a strong interest; and we have welcomed, as the result of that strife, the addition of a great kingdom to the list of European states. Now our eyes are turned in a contrary direction, and we look to the West. There we see a struggle in progress of the very highest interest to England and to humanity at large. We see there a nation which I shall call the transatlantic English nation—the inheritor and partaker of all the historic glories of this country. We see it torn with intestine broils, and suffering from calamities from which for more than a century past—in fact, for more than two centuries past—this country has been exempt. That struggle is of especial interest to us. We remember

the description which one of our great poets gives of Rome:—

"Lone mother of dead empires."

But England is the living mother of great nations on the American and on the Australian continents, which promise to endow the world with all her knowledge and all her civilization, and with even something more than the freedom she herself enjoys.

Eighty-five years ago, at the time when some of our oldest townsmen were very little children, there were, on the North American continent, colonies, mainly of Englishmen, containing about three millions of souls. These colonies we have seen a year ago constituting the United States of North America, and comprising a population of no less than thirty millions of souls. We know that in agriculture and manufactures, with the exception of this kingdom, there is no country in the world which in these arts may be placed in advance of the United States. With regard to inventions, I believe, within the last thirty years, we have received more useful inventions from the United States than from all the other countries of the earth. In that country there are probably ten times as many miles of telegraph as there are in this country, and there are at least five or six times as many miles of railway. The tonnage of its shipping is at least equal to ours, if it does not exceed ours. The prisons of that country—for, even in countries the most favored, prisons are needful—have been models for other nations of the earth; and many European governments have sent missions at different times to inquire into the admirable system of education so universally adopted in their free schools throughout the Northern states.

If I were to speak of that country in a religious aspect, I should say that, considering the short space of time to which their history goes back, there is nothing on the face of the earth besides, and never has been, to equal the magnificent arrangement of churches and ministers, and of all the appliances which are thought necessary for a nation to teach Christianity and morality to its people. Besides all this, when I state that for many years past the annual public expenditure of the government of that country has

been somewhere between £10,000,000 and £15,000,000, I need not, perhaps, say further that there has always existed among all the population an amount of comfort and prosperity and abounding plenty such as I believe no other country in the world, in any age, has enjoyed.

This is a very fine, but a very true picture; yet it has another side to which I must advert. There has been one great feature in that country, one great contrast, which has been pointed to by all who have commented upon the United States as a feature of danger, as a contrast calculated to give pain. There has been in that country the utmost liberty to the white man, and bondage and degradation to the black man. Now rely upon it, that wherever Christianity lives and flourishes, there must grow up from it, necessarily, a conscience hostile to any oppression and to any wrong; and therefore, from the hour when the United States Constitution was formed, so long as it left there this great evil—then comparatively small, but now so great—it left there seeds of that which an American statesman has so happily described of that "irrepressible conflict" of which now the whole world is the witness. It has been a common thing for men disposed to carp at the United States to point to this blot upon their fair fame, and to compare it with the boasted declaration of freedom in their Deed and Declaration of Independence. But we must recollect who sowed this seed of trouble, and how and by whom it has been cherished.

Without dwelling upon this stain any longer, I should like to read to you a paragraph from the instructions understood to have been given to the Virginian delegates to Congress, in the month of August, 1774, by Mr. Jefferson, who was, perhaps, the ablest man the United States had produced up to that time, and who was then actively engaged in its affairs, and who afterward, for two periods, filled the office of President. He represented one of these very slave states—the State of Virginia—and he says:—

"For the most trifling reasons, and sometimes for no conceivable reason at all, his majesty has rejected laws of the most salutary tendency. The abolition of domestic slavery is the great object of desire in those colonies where it was unhappily introduced in their infant state. But previous to the enfranchisement of the slaves we have, it is neces-

sary to exclude all further importations from Africa. Yet our repeated attempts to effect this by prohibition, and by imposing duties which might amount to prohibition, have hitherto been defeated by his majesty's negative—thus preferring the immediate advantages of a few British corsairs to the lasting interests of the American states, and to the rights of human nature, deeply wounded by this infamous practise."

I read this merely to show that, two years before the Declaration of Independence was signed, Mr. Jefferson, acting on behalf of those he represented in Virginia, wrote that protest against the course of the English government which prevented the colonists from abolishing the slave trade, preparatory to the abolition of slavery itself.

Well, the United States Constitution left the slave question for every state to manage for itself. It was a question too difficult to settle then, and apparently every man had the hope and belief that in a few years slavery itself would become extinct. Then there happened a great event in the annals of manufactures and commerce. It was discovered that in those states that article which we in this country now so much depend on could be produced of the best quality necessary for manufacture, and at a moderate price. From that day to this the growth of cotton has increased there, and its consumption has increased here, and a value which no man dreamed of when Jefferson wrote that paper has been given to the slave and to slave industry. Thus it has grown up to that gigantic institution which now threatens either its own overthrow or the overthrow of that which is a million times more valuable—the United States of America.

The crisis at which we have arrived—I say "we," for, after all, we are nearly as much interested as if I was making this speech in the city of Boston or the city of New York—the crisis, I say, which has now arrived, was inevitable. I say that the conscience of the North, never satisfied with the institution of slavery, was constantly urging some men forward to take a more extreme view of the question; and there grew up naturally a section—it may not have been a very numerous one—in favor of the abolition of slavery. A great and powerful party resolved at least upon a restraint and a control of slavery, so that it should not extend beyond the states and the area which it now occu-

pies. But, if we look at the Government of the United States almost ever since the formation of the Union, we shall find the Southern power has been mostly dominant there. If we take thirty-six years after the formation of the present Constitution—I think about 1787—we shall find that for thirty-two of those years every President was a southern man; and if we take the period from 1828 until 1860, we shall find that, on every election for President, the South voted in the majority.

We know what an election is in the United States for President of the republic. There is a most extensive suffrage, and there is the ballot-box. The members of the House of Representatives are elected by the same suffrage, and generally they are elected at the same time. It is thus therefore almost inevitable that the House of Representatives is in accord in public policy with the President for the time being. Every four years there springs from the vote created by the whole people a President over that great nation. I think the world offers no finer spectacle than this; it offers no higher dignity; and there is no greater object of ambition on the political stage on which men are permitted to move. You may point, if you will, to hereditary rulers, to crowns coming down through successive generations of the same family, to thrones based on prescription or on conquest, to scepters wielded over veteran legions and subject realms; but to my mind there is nothing more worthy of reverence and obedience, and nothing more sacred, than the authority of the freely chosen magistrate of a great and free people; and if there be on earth and among men any right divine to govern, surely it rests with a ruler so chosen and so appointed.

Last year the ceremony of this great election was gone through, and the South, which had been so long successful, found itself defeated. That defeat was followed instantly by secession and insurrection and war. In the multitude of articles which have been before us in the newspapers within the last few months, I have no doubt you have seen it stated, as I have seen it, that this question was very much like that upon which the colonies originally revolted against the crown of England. It is amazing how little some newspaper writers know, or how little they think

you know. When the War of Independence was begun in America, ninety years ago, there were no representatives there at all. The question then was, whether a ministry in Downing Street, and a corrupt and borough-mongering parliament, should continue to impose taxes upon three millions of English subjects who had left their native shores and established themselves in North America. But now the question is not the want of representation, because, as is perfectly notorious, the South is not only represented, but is represented in excess; for, in distributing the number of representatives, which is done every ten years, three out of every five slaves are counted as freemen, and the number of representatives from the slave states is consequently so much greater than if the freemen, the white men only, were counted. From this cause the Southern states have twenty members more in the House of Representatives than they would have if the members were apportioned on the same principle as in the Northern free states. Therefore you will see at once that there is no comparison between the state of things when the colonies revolted, and the state of things now, when this wicked insurrection has broken out.

There is another cause which is sometimes in England assigned for this great misfortune, which is, the protective theories in operation in the Union, and the maintenance of a high tariff. It happens with regard to that, unfortunately, that no American, certainly no one I ever met with, attributed the disasters of the Union to that cause. It is an argument made use of by ignorant Englishmen, but never by informed Americans. I have already shown you that the South, during almost the whole existence of the Union, has been dominant at Washington; and during that period the tariff has existed, and there has been no general dissatisfaction with it. Occasionally, there can be no doubt, their tariff was higher than was thought just or reasonable or necessary by some of the states of the South. But the first act of the United States which levied duties upon imports, passed immediately after the Union was formed, recited that "It is necessary for the encouragement and protection of manufactures to levy the duties which follow"; and during the war with England from 1812 to 1815

the people of the United States had to pay for all the articles they brought from Europe many times over the natural cost of those articles, on account of the interruption to the traffic by the English nation.

When the war was over, it was felt by everybody desirable that they should encourage manufactures in their own country; and seeing that England at that precise moment was passing a law to prevent any wheat coming from America until wheat in England had risen to the price of eighty-four shillings per quarter, we may be quite satisfied that the doctrine of protection originally entertained did not find less favor at the close of the war in 1815.

There is one remarkable point with regard to this matter which should not be forgotten. Twelve months ago, at the meeting of the Congress of the United States, on the first Monday in December, when the Congress met, you recollect that there were various propositions of compromise, committee meetings of various kinds to try and devise some mode of settling the question between the North and the South, so that disunion might not go on. Though I read carefully everything published in the English papers from the United States on the subject, I do not recollect that in a single instance the question of the tariff was referred to, or any change proposed or suggested in the matter as likely to have any effect whatever upon the question of secession.

There is another point: Whatever might be the influence of the tariff upon the United States, it is as pernicious to the West as it is to the South; and further, that Louisiana, which is a Southern state and a seceded state, has always voted along with Pennsylvania until last year in favor of protection—protection for its sugar—while Pennsylvania wished protection for its coal and iron. But if the tariff was onerous and grievous, was that any reason for this great insurrection? Was there ever a country that had a tariff, especially in the article of food, more onerous and more cruel than that which we had in this country twenty years ago? We did not secede. We did not rebel. What we did was to raise money for the purpose of distributing among all the people perfect information upon the question; and many men, as you know, devoted all their labors, for several years, to teach the great and wise doctrine of

free trade to the people of England. The price of a single gunboat, the equipment of a single regiment, the garrisoning of a single fort, the cessation of their trade for a single day, cost more than it would have cost to spread among all the intelligent people of the United States the most complete statement of the whole case; and the West and South could easily have revised, or, if need had been, have repealed the tariff altogether.

The question is a very different and a far more grave question. It is a question of slavery, and for thirty years it has constantly been coming to the surface, disturbing social life, and overthrowing almost all political harmony in the working of the United States. In the North there is no secession; there is no collision. These disturbances and this insurrection are found wholly in the South and in the slave states; and therefore I think that the man who says otherwise, who contends that it is the tariff, or anything whatsoever else than slavery, is either himself deceived or endeavors to deceive others. The object of the South is this: to escape from the majority who wish to limit the area of slavery. They wish to found a slave state freed from the influence and opinions of freedom. The free states in the North now stand before the world as the advocates and defenders of freedom and civilization. The slave states offer themselves for the recognition of a Christian nation, based upon the foundation, the unchangeable foundation in their eyes, of slavery and barbarism.

I will not discuss the guilt of the men who, ministers of a great nation only last year, conspired to overthrow it. I will not point out or recapitulate the statements of the fraudulent manner in which they disposed of the funds in the national exchequer. I will not point out by name any of the men, in this conspiracy, whom history will designate by titles they would not like to hear; but I say that slavery has sought to break up the most free government in the world, and to found a new state, in the nineteenth century, whose corner-stone is the perpetual bondage of millions of men.

Having thus described what appears to me briefly the literal truth of this matter, what is the course that England would be expected to pursue? We should be neutral as far

as regards mingling in the strife. We were neutral in the strife in Italy; but we were not neutral in opinion or sympathy; and we know perfectly well that throughout the whole of Italy at this moment there is a feeling that, though no shot was fired from an English ship, and though no English soldier trod their soil, yet still the opinion of England was potent in Europe, and did much for the creation of the Italian kingdom.

With regard to the United States, you know how much we hate slavery—that is, some years ago we thought we knew; that we have given twenty millions sterling—a million a year, or nearly so, of taxes forever—to free eight hundred thousand slaves in the English colonies. We knew, or thought we knew, how much we were in love with free government everywhere, although it might not take precisely the same form as our own government. We were for free government in Italy; we were for free government in Switzerland; and we were for free government, even under a republican form, in the United States of America; and with all this, every man would have said that England would wish the American Union to be prosperous and eternal.

Now, suppose we turn our eyes to the East, to the empire of Russia, for a moment. In Russia, as you all know, there has been one of the most important and magnificent changes of policy ever seen in any country. Within the last year or two the present Emperor of Russia, following the wishes of his father, has insisted upon the abolition of serfdom in that empire; and twenty-three millions of human beings, lately serfs, little better than real slaves, have been raised to the ranks of freedom. Now, suppose that the millions of the serfs of Russia had been chiefly in the south of Russia. We hear of the nobles of Russia, to whom those serfs belonged in a great measure, that they have been hostile to this change; and there has been some danger that the peace of that empire might be disturbed during the change. Suppose these nobles, for the purpose of maintaining in perpetuity the serfdom of Russia, and barring out twenty-three millions of your fellow creatures from the rights of freedom, had established a great and secret conspiracy, and that they had risen in great and dangerous

insurrection against the Russian government. I say that you, the people of England, although seven years ago you were in mortal combat with the Russians in the south of Europe—I believe at this moment you would have prayed Heaven in all sincerity and fervor to give strength to the arm and success to the great wishes of the emperor, and that the vile and atrocious insurrection might be suppressed.

Well, but let us look a little at what has been said and done in this country since the period when parliament rose at the beginning of August. There have been two speeches to which I wish to refer, and in terms of approbation. The Duke of Argyle, a member of the present government—and, though I have not the smallest personal acquaintance with him, I am free to say that I believe him to be one of the most intelligent and liberal of his order—the Duke of Argyle made a speech which was fair and friendly to the Government of the United States. Lord Stanley, only a fortnight ago, I think, made a speech which it is impossible to read without remarking the thought, the liberality, and the wisdom by which it is distinguished. He doubted, it is true, whether the Union could be restored. A man need not be hostile, and must not necessarily be unfriendly, to doubt that or the contrary; but he spoke with fairness and friendliness of the government of the United States; and he said that they were right and justifiable in the course they took; and he gave us some advice—which is now more important than at the moment when it was given—that amid the various incidents and accidents of a struggle of this nature, it became a people like this to be very moderate, very calm, and to avoid, as much as possible, any feeling of irritation, which sometimes arises, and sometimes leads to danger.

I mention these two speeches as from Englishmen of great distinction in this country—speeches which I believe will have a beneficial effect on the other side of the Atlantic. Lord John Russell, in the House of Commons, during the last session, made a speech also, in which he rebuked the impertinence of a young member of the House who had spoken about the bursting of the "bubble republic." It was a speech worthy of the best days of Lord John Russell. But at a later period he spoke at Newcastle, on an occasion

something like this, when the inhabitants, or some portion of the inhabitants, of the town invited him to a public dinner. He described the contest in words something like these—I speak from memory only: "The North is contending for empire, the South for independence." Did he mean contending for empire, as England contends for it when making some fresh conquest in India? If he meant that, what he said was not true. But I recollect Lord John Russell, some years ago, in the House of Commons, on an occasion when I made some observation as to the unreasonable expenditure of our colonies, and said that the people of England should not be taxed to defray expenses which the colonies themselves were well able to bear, turned to me with a sharpness which was not necessary, and said, "The honorable member has no objection to make a great empire into a little one; but I have." Perhaps, if he had lived in the United States, if he was a member of the Senate or the House of Representatives there, he would doubt whether it was his duty to consent at once to the destruction of a great country by separation, it may be into two hostile camps; or whether he would not try all the means which were open to him, and would be open to the government, to avert so unlooked-for and so dire a calamity.

There are other speeches that have been made. I will not refer to them by any quotation—I will not, out of pity to some of the men who uttered them. I will not bring their names even before you, to give them an endurance which I hope they will not otherwise obtain. I leave them in the obscurity which they so richly merit. But you know, as well as I do, that of all the speeches made since the end of the last session of parliament by public men, by politicians, the majority of them have either displayed a strange ignorance of American affairs, or a stranger absence of that cordiality and friendship which, I maintain, our American kinsmen have a right to look for at our hands.

And if we part from the speakers and turn to the writers, what do we find there? We find that which is reputed abroad, and has hitherto been believed in at home, as the most powerful representative of English opinion—at least of the richer classes—we find in that particular newspaper there has not been since Mr. Lincoln took office, in March

last, as President of the United States, one fair and honorable and friendly article on American affairs. Some of you, I dare say, read it; but, fortunately, every district is now so admirably supplied with local newspapers, that I trust in all time to come the people of England will drink of purer streams nearer home, and not of those streams which are muddled by party feeling and political intrigue, and by many motives that tend to anything rather than the enlightenment and advantage of the people. It is said—that very paper has said over and over again—"Why this war? Why not separate peaceably? Why this fratricidal strife?" I hope it is equally averse to fratricidal strife in other districts; for if it be true that God made of one blood all the families of man to dwell on the face of all the earth, it must be fratricidal strife whether we are slaughtering Russians in the Crimea or bombarding towns on the seacoasts of the United States.

Now no one will expect that I should stand forward as the advocate of war, or as the defender of that great sum of all crimes which is involved in war. But when we are discussing a question of this nature, it is only fair that we should discuss it upon principles which are acknowledged not only in the country where the strife is being carried on, but are universally acknowledged in this country. When I discussed the Russian War, seven or eight years ago, I always condemned it, on principles which were accepted by the government and people of England, and I took my facts from the blue-books presented to parliament. I take the liberty, then, of doing that in this case; and I say that, looking at the principles avowed in England, and at its policy, there is no man, who is not absolutely a non-resistant in every one sense, who can fairly challenge the conduct of the American government in this war. It would be a curious thing to find that the party in this country which on every public question affecting England is in favor of war at any cost, when they come to speak of the duty of the Government of the United States, is in favor "of peace at any price."

I want to know whether it has ever been admitted by politicians, or statesmen, or people, that a great nation can be broken up at any time by any particular section of any

part of that nation. It has been tried occasionally in Ireland, and if it had succeeded history would have said that it was with very good cause. But if anybody tried now to get up a secession or insurrection in Ireland—and it would be infinitely less disturbing to everything than the secession in the United States, because there is a boundary which nobody can dispute—I am quite sure the "Times" would have its "Special Correspondent," and would describe with all the glee and exultation in the world the manner in which the Irish insurrectionists were cut down and made an end of.

Let any man try in this country to restore the heptarchy. Do you think that any portion of the people would think that the project could be tolerated for a moment? But if you look at a map of the United States, you will see that there is no country in the world, probably, at this moment, where any plan of separation between the North and the South, as far as the question of boundary is concerned, is so surrounded with insurmountable difficulties. For example, Maryland is a slave state; but Maryland, by a large majority, voted for the Union. Kentucky is a slave state, one of the finest in the Union, and containing a fine people; Kentucky has voted for the Union, but has been invaded from the South. Missouri is a slave state; but Missouri has not seceded, and has been invaded by the South, and there is a secession party in that state. There are parts of Virginia which have formed themselves into a new state, resolved to adhere to the North; and there is no doubt a considerable Northern and Union feeling in the State of Tennessee. I have no doubt there is in every other state. In fact, I am not sure that there is not now within the sound of my voice a citizen of the State of Alabama, who could tell you that in his state the question of secession has never been put to the vote; and that there are great numbers of men, reasonable and thoughtful and just men, in that state, who entirely deplore the condition of things there existing.

Then, what would you do with all those states, and with what we may call the loyal portion of the people of those states? Would you allow them to be dragooned into this insurrection, and into the formation or the becoming parts of a new state, to which they themselves are hostile? And

what would you do with the city of Washington? Washington is in a slave state. Would anybody have advised that President Lincoln and his Cabinet, with all the members of Congress, of the House of Representatives and the Senate, from the North, with their wives and children, and everybody else who was not positively in favor of the South, should have set off on their melancholy pilgrimage northward, leaving that capital, hallowed to them by such associations—having its name even from the Father of their Country—leaving Washington to the South, because Washington is situated in a slave state?

Again, what do you say to the Mississippi River, as you see it upon the map, the "father of waters," rolling its gigantic stream to the ocean? Do you think that the fifty millions which one day will occupy the banks of that river northward, will ever consent that its great stream shall roll through a foreign and it may be a hostile state? And more, there are four millions of negroes in subjection. For them the American Union is directly responsible. They are not secessionists; they are now, as they always were, not citizens nor subjects, but legally under the care and power of the Government of the United States. Would you consent that these should be delivered up to the tender mercies of their taskmasters, the defenders of slavery, as an everlasting institution?

But if all had been surrendered without a struggle, what then? What would the writers in this newspaper and other newspapers have said? If a bare rock in your empire, that would not keep a goat—a single goat—alive, be touched by any foreign power, the whole empire is roused to resistance; and if there be, from accident or passion, the smallest insult to your flag, what do your newspaper writers say upon the subject, and what is said in all your towns and upon all your exchanges? I will tell you what they would have said if the government of the Northern states had taken their insidious and dishonest advice. They would have said the great republic was a failure, that democracy had murdered patriotism, that history afforded no example of such meanness and of such cowardice; and they would have heaped unmeasured obloquy and contempt upon the people and government who had taken that course.

They tell you, these candid friends of the United States —they tell you that all freedom is gone; that the Habeas Corpus Act, if they ever had one, is known no longer; and that any man may be arrested at the dictum of the President or of the secretary of state. Well, but in 1848, you recollect, many of you, that there was a small insurrection in Ireland. It was an absurd thing altogether; but what was done then? I saw, in one night, in the House of Commons, a bill for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act passed through all its stages. What more did I see? I saw a bill brought in by the Whig government of that day, Lord John Russell being the premier, which made speaking against the government and against the crown—which up to that time had been sedition—which proposed to make it felony; and it was only by the greatest exertions of a few of the members that the act, in that particular, was limited to a period of two years. In the same session a bill was brought in called an alien bill, which enabled the home secretary to take any foreigner whatsoever, not being a naturalized Englishman, and in twenty-four hours to send him out of the country. Although a man might have committed no crime, this might be done to him, apparently only on suspicion.

But suppose that an insurgent army had been so near to London that you could see its outposts from every suburb of your capital, what then do you think would have been the regard of the Government of Great Britain for personal liberty, if it interfered with the necessities, and, as they might think, the salvation of the state? I recollect, in 1848, when the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended in Ireland, that a number of persons in Liverpool, men there of position and of wealth, presented a petition to the House of Commons, praying—what? That the Habeas Corpus Act should not be suspended? No. They were not content with its suspension in Ireland; and they prayed the House of Commons to extend that suspension to Liverpool.

I recollect that at that time—and I am sure my friend Mr. Wilson will bear me out in what I say—the Mayor of Liverpool telegraphed to the Mayor of Manchester, and that messages were sent on to London nearly every hour. The Mayor of Manchester heard from the Mayor of Liver-

pool that certain Irishmen in Liverpool, conspirators, or fellow conspirators with those in Ireland, were going to burn the cotton warehouses in Liverpool and the cotton-mills of Lancashire. I read that petition from Liverpool. I took it from the table of the House of Commons, and read it, and I handed it over to a statesman of great eminence, who has been but just removed from us—I refer to Sir James Graham, a man not second to any in the House of Commons for his knowledge of affairs and for his great capacity—I handed to him that petition. He read it; and after he had read it he rose from his seat, and laid it upon the table with a gesture of abhorrence and disgust. Now that was a petition from the town of Liverpool, in which some persons have been making themselves very ridiculous of late by reason of their conduct on this American question.

There is one more point. It has been said, "How much better it would be"—not for the United States, but—"for us that these states should be divided." I recollect meeting a gentleman in Bond Street one day before the session was over. He was a rich man, and one whose voice is much heard in the House of Commons; but his voice is not heard when he is on his legs, but when he is cheering other speakers; and he said to me: "After all, this is a sad business about the United States; but still I think it very much better that they should be split up. In twenty years"—or in fifty years, I forget which it was—"they will be so powerful that they will bully all Europe." And a distinguished member of the House of Commons—distinguished there by his eloquence, distinguished more by his many writings—I mean Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton—he did not exactly express a hope, but he ventured on something like a prediction, that the time would come when there would be, I do not know how many, but about as many independent states on the American continent as you can count upon your fingers.

There cannot be a meaner motive than this I am speaking of, in forming a judgment on this question—that it is "better for us"—for whom, the people of England or the government of England?—that the United States should be severed, and that the North American continent should be as the continent of Europe is, in many states, and subject to all the contentions and disasters which have accompanied

the history of the states of Europe. I should say that, if a man had a great heart within him, he would rather look forward to the day when, from that point of land which is habitable nearest to the Pole, to the shores of the Great Gulf, the whole of that vast continent might become one great confederation of states—without a great army, and without a great navy—not mixing itself up with the entanglements of European politics—without a custom-house inside, through the whole length and breadth of its territory—and with freedom everywhere, equality everywhere, law everywhere, peace everywhere—such a confederation would afford at least some hope that man is not forsaken of Heaven, and that the future of our race may be better than the past.

It is a common observation that our friends in America are very irritable. And I think it is very likely, of a considerable number of them, to be quite true. Our friends in America are involved in a great struggle. There is nothing like it before in their or in any history. No country in the world was ever more entitled, in my opinion, to the sympathy and the forbearance of all friendly nations than are the United States at this moment. They have there some newspapers that are no wiser than ours. They have there some papers, which, up to the election of Mr. Lincoln, were his bitterest and most unrelenting foes, who, when the war broke out, and it was not safe to take the line of southern support, were obliged to turn round and to appear to adopt the prevalent opinion of the country. But they undertook to serve the South in another way, and that was by exaggerating every difficulty and misstating every fact, if so doing could serve their object of creating distrust between the people of the northern states and the people of this United Kingdom. If the "Times" in this country has done all that it could do to poison the minds of the people of England, and to irritate the minds of the people of America, the New York "Herald," I am sorry to say, has done, I think, all that it could, or all that it dared to do, to provoke mischief between the government in Washington and the government in London.

Now there is one thing which I must state that I think they have a solid reason to complain of; and I am very

sorry to have to mention it, because it blames our present foreign minister, against whom I am not anxious to say a word, and, recollecting his speech in the House of Commons, I should be slow to conclude that he had any feeling hostile to the United States government. You recollect that during the session—it was on the fourteenth of May—a proclamation came out which acknowledged the South as a belligerent power, and proclaimed the neutrality of England. A little time before that—I forget how many days—Mr. Dallas, the late minister from the United States, had left London for Liverpool and America. He did not wish to undertake any affairs for his government, by which he was not appointed—I mean that of President Lincoln—and he left what had to be done to his successor, who was on his way, and whose arrival was daily expected. Mr. Adams, the present minister from the United States, is a man whom, if he lived in England, you would speak of as belonging to one of the noblest families of the country. His father and his grandfather were presidents of the United States. His grandfather was one of the great men who achieved the independence of the United States. There is no family in that country having more claims upon what I should call the veneration and the affection of the people than the family of Mr. Adams.

Mr. Adams came to this country. He arrived in London on the night of the thirteenth of May. On the fourteenth that proclamation was issued. It was known that he was coming; but he was not consulted; the proclamation was not delayed for a day, although there was nothing pressing, no reason why the proclamation should not have been notified to him. If communications of a friendly nature had taken place with him and with the American government, they could have found no fault with this step, because it was perhaps inevitable, before the struggle had proceeded far, that this proclamation would be issued. But I have the best reasons for knowing that there is no single thing that has happened during the course of these events which has created more surprise, more irritation, and more distrust in the United States, with respect to this country, than the fact that that proclamation was not delayed one single day, until the minister from America could come

here, and until it could be done, if not with his consent or his concurrence, yet in that friendly manner that would probably have avoided all the unpleasantness which has occurred.

Now I am obliged to say—and I say it with the utmost pain—that if we have not done things that are plainly hostile to the North, and if we have not expressed affection for slavery, and, outwardly and openly, hatred for the Union —I say that there has not been that friendly and cordial neutrality which, if I had been a citizen of the United States, I should have expected; and I say further, that, if there has existed considerable irritation at that, it must be taken as a measure of the high appreciation which the people of those states place upon the opinion of the people of England. If I had been addressing this audience ten days ago, so far as I know, I should have said just what I have said now; and although, by an untoward event, circumstances are somewhat, even considerably, altered, yet I have thought it desirable to make this statement, with a view, so far as I am able to do it, to improve the opinion of England, and to assuage feelings of irritation in America, if there be any, so that no further difficulties may arise in the progress of this unhappy strife.

But there has occurred an event which was announced to us only a week ago, which is one of great importance, and it may be one of some peril. It is asserted that what is called "international law" has been broken by the seizure of the southern commissioners on board an English trading steamer by a steamer of war of the United States. Now, what is international law? You have heard that the opinions of the law officers of the crown are in favor of this view of the case—that the law has been broken. I am not at all going to say that it has not. It would be imprudent in me to set my opinion on a legal question which I have only partially examined, against their opinion on the same question, which I presume they have carefully examined. But this I say, that international law is not to be found in an act of parliament—it is not in so many clauses. You know that it is difficult to find the law. I can ask the mayor, or any magistrate around me, whether it is not very difficult to find the law, even when you have found the act of par-

liament and found the clause. But when you have no act of parliament, and no clause, you may imagine that the case is still more difficult.

Now, maritime law, or international law, consists of opinions and precedents for the most part, and it is very unsettled. The opinions are the opinions of men of different countries, given at different times; and the precedents are not always like each other. The law is very unsettled, and, for the most part, I believe it to be exceedingly bad. In past times, as you know from the histories you read, this country has been a fighting country; we have been belligerents, and, as belligerents, we have carried maritime law, by our own powerful hand, to a pitch that has been very oppressive to foreign, and especially so to neutral, nations. Well, now, for the first time, unhappily—almost for the first time in our history for the last two hundred years—we are not belligerents, but neutrals; and we are disposed to take, perhaps, rather a different view of maritime and international law.

Now, the act which has been committed by the American steamer, in my opinion, whether it was legal or not, was both impolitic and bad. That is my opinion. I think it may turn out, almost certainly, that, so far as the taking of those men from that ship was concerned, it was an act wholly unknown to, and unauthorized by, the American government. And if the American government believe, on the opinion of their law officers, that the act is illegal, I have no doubt they will make fitting reparation; for there is no government in the world that has so strenuously insisted upon modifications of international law, and been so anxious to be guided always by the most moderate and merciful interpretation of that law.

Now, our great advisers of the "Times" newspaper have been persuading people that this is merely one of a series of acts which denote the determination of the Washington government to pick a quarrel with the people of England. Did you ever know anybody who was not very nearly dead drunk, who, having as much upon his hands as he could manage, would offer to fight everybody about him? Do you believe that the United States government, presided over by President Lincoln, so constitutional in all his acts, so

moderate as he has been—representing at this moment that great party in the United States, happily now in the ascendency, which has always been especially in favor of peace, and especially friendly to England—do you believe that such a government, having now upon its hands an insurrection of the most formidable character in the South, would invite the armies and the fleets of England to combine with that insurrection, and, it might be, to render it impossible that the Union should ever again be restored? I say, that single statement, whether it came from a public writer or a public speaker, is enough to stamp him forever with the character of being an insidious enemy of both countries.

Well now, what have we seen during the last week? People have not been, I am told—I have not seen much of it—quite as calm as sensible men should be. Here is a question of law. I will undertake to say that when you have from the United States government—if they think the act legal—a statement of their view of the case, they will show you that, fifty or sixty years ago, during the wars of that time, there were scores of cases that were at least as bad as this, and some infinitely worse. And if it were not so late to-night—and I am not anxious now to go into the question further—I could easily place before you cases of extreme outrage committed by us when we were at war, and for many of which, I am afraid, little or no reparation was offered. But let us bear this in mind, that during this struggle incidents and accidents will happen. Bear in mind the advice of Lord Stanley, so opportune and so judicious. Do not let your newspapers, or your public speakers, or any man, take you off your guard, and bring you into that frame of mind under which your government, if it desires war, may be driven to engage in it; for one may be almost as fatal and as evil as the other.

What can be more monstrous than that we, as we call ourselves, to some extent, an educated, a moral, and a Christian nation—at a moment when an accident of this kind occurs, before we have made a representation to the American government, before we have heard a word from it in reply—should be all up in arms, every sword leaping from its scabbard, and every man looking about for his pistols and his blunderbusses? I think the conduct pursued

—and I have no doubt just the same is pursued by a certain class in America—is much more the conduct of savages than of Christian and civilized men. No, let us be calm. You recollect how we were dragged into the Russian war—how we "drifted" into it. You know that I, at least, have not upon my head any of the guilt of that fearful war. You know that it cost one hundred millions of money to this country; that it cost at least the lives of forty thousand Englishmen; that it disturbed your trade; that it nearly doubled the armies of Europe; that it placed the relations of Europe on a much less peaceful footing than before; and that it did not effect one single thing of all those that it was promised to effect.

I recollect speaking on this subject, within the last two years, to a man whose name I have already mentioned, Sir James Graham, in the House of Commons. He was a minister at the time of that war. He was reminding me of a severe onslaught which I had made upon him and Lord Palmerston for attending a dinner at the Reform Club when Sir Charles Napier was appointed to the command of the Baltic fleet; and he remarked, "What a severe thrashing" I had given them in the House of Commons! I said, "Sir James, tell me candidly, did you not deserve it?" He said, "Well, you were entirely right about that war; we were entirely wrong, and we never should have gone into it." And this is exactly what everybody will say, if you go into a war about this business, when it is over. When your sailors and soldiers, so many of them as may be slaughtered, are gone to their last account; when your taxes are increased, your business—permanently it may be —injured; and when embittered feelings for generations have been created between America and England—then your statesmen will tell you that "we ought not to have gone into the war."

But they will very likely say, as many of them tell me, "What could we do in the frenzy of the public mind?" Let them not add to the frenzy, and let us be careful that nobody drives us into that frenzy. Remembering the past, remembering at this moment the perils of a friendly people, and seeing the difficulties by which they are surrounded, let us, I entreat of you, see if there be any real moderation in the

people of England, and if magnanimity, so often to be found among individuals, is absolutely wanting in a great nation.

Now, government may discuss this matter—they may arrange it—they may arbitrate it. I have received here, since I came into the room, a despatch from a friend of mine in London, referring to this matter. I believe some portion of it is in the papers this evening, but I have not seen them. He states that General Scott, whom you know by name, who has come over from America to France, being in a bad state of health—the general lately of the American army, and a man whose reputation in that country is hardly second to that which the Duke of Wellington held during his lifetime in this country—General Scott has written a letter on the American difficulty. He denies that the cabinet at Washington had ordered the seizure of the Southern commissioners, if found under a neutral flag. The question of legal right involved in the seizure, the general thinks a very narrow ground on which to force a quarrel with the United States. As to Messrs. Slidell and Mason being or not being contraband, the general answers for it, that, if Mr. Seward could convince Earl Russell that they bore that character, Earl Russell will be able to convince Mr. Seward that they did not. He pledges himself that, if this government cordially agreed with that of the United States in establishing the immunity of neutrals from the oppressive right of search and seizure on suspicion, the cabinet at Washington will not hesitate to purchase so great a boon to peaceful trading vessels.

Now, then, before I sit down, let me ask you what is this people, about which so many men in England at this moment are writing, and speaking, and thinking, with harshness—I think with injustice, if not with great bitterness? Two centuries ago, multitudes of the people of this country found a refuge on the North American continent, escaping from the tyranny of the Stuarts and from the bigotry of Laud. Many noble spirits from our country made great experiments in favor of human freedom on that continent. Bancroft, the great historian of his own country, has said, in his own graphic and emphatic language, "The history of the colonization of America is the history of the crimes of Europe."

At this very moment, then, there are millions in the United States who personally, or whose immediate parents, have at one time been citizens of this country. They found a home in the far West; they subdued the wilderness; they met with plenty there, which was not afforded them in their native country; and they have become a great people. There may be persons in England who are jealous of those states. There may be men who dislike democracy, and who hate a republic; there may be even those whose sympathies warm toward the slave oligarchy of the South. But of this I am certain, that only misrepresentation the most gross or calumny the most wicked can sever the tie which unites the great mass of the people of this country with their friends and brethren beyond the Atlantic.

Now, whether the Union will be restored or not, or the South achieve an unhonored independence or not, I know not, and I predict not. But this I think I know—that in a few years, a very few years, the twenty millions of freemen in the North will be thirty millions, or even fifty millions—a population equal to or exceeding that of this kingdom. When that time comes, I pray that it may not be said among them that, in the darkest hour of their country's trials, England, the land of their fathers, looked on with icy coldness and saw unmoved the perils and calamities of their children. As for me, I have but this to say: I am but one in this audience, and but one in the citizenship of this country; but if all other tongues are silent, mine shall speak for that policy which gives hope to the bondmen of the South, and which tends to generous thoughts, and generous words, and generous deeds, between the two great nations who speak the English language, and from their origin are alike entitled to the English name.

PRESTON S. BROOKS

ON THE SUMNER ASSAULT

[Preston Smith Brooks, congressman and lawyer, was born in Edgefield District, S. C., 1819. He was educated in his native district school until early manhood, when he matriculated at the South Carolina College, where he graduated in 1839. On leaving college he devoted himself to the study of law, and in 1843 was admitted to the bar. In 1844 he was elected to the South Carolina Legislature. During the Mexican War he was enrolled as captain of the Palmetto regiment of his native state. At the close of the war he directed his attention to politics and joined the party of the state rights Democrats, and soon came to the front as a man of conspicuous ability, and of fiery enthusiasm as an advocate of Southern claims. In 1853 he was elected to Congress. His political career was brought to a close by an act of violence on his part which keeps his name in history through the illustrious name and character of his victim, Charles Sumner, who never recovered from the effects of the brutal assault. The attack was provoked by the senator's attack on Senator Butler of South Carolina, with whom Brooks claimed to be connected by ties of blood. The assailant was tried by a committee of the House, who recommended Mr. Brooks' expulsion from the House of Representatives. When put to the vote the motion was lost. The impetuous temper of Brooks was exhibited later in his dispute with Anson Burlingame, whom he challenged to a duel, but failed to put in an appearance at the time and place appointed for the meeting. Although he resigned his seat in the House in 1856, he was reëlected, but died in 1857. The following speech, alluding directly to the Sumner assault, and announcing the speaker's resignation from Congress, was delivered in the House of Representatives in 1856.]

MR. SPEAKER: Some time since a senator from Massachusetts allowed himself, in an elaborately prepared speech, to offer a gross insult to my state, and to a venerable friend who is my State Representative, and who was absent at the time.

Not content with that, he published to the world and

circulated extensively this uncalled-for libel on my state and my blood. Whatever insults my state insults me. Her history and character have commanded my pious veneration; and in her defense I hope I shall always be prepared, humbly and modestly, to perform the duty of a son. I should have forfeited my own self-respect, and perhaps the good opinion of my countrymen, if I failed to resent such an injury by calling the offender in question to a personal account. It was a personal affair, and in taking redress into my own hands I meant no disrespect to the Senate of the United States or to this House.

Nor, sir, did I design insult or disrespect to the State of Massachusetts. I was aware of the personal responsibilities I incurred, and was willing to meet them. I knew, too, that I was amenable to the laws of the country, which afford the same protection to all, whether they be members of Congress or private citizens. I did not, and do not now believe, that I could be properly punished, not only in a court of law, but here also, at the pleasure and discretion of the House. I did not then, and do not now, believe that the spirit of American freemen would tolerate slander in high places and permit a member of Congress to publish and circulate a libel on another, and then call upon either House to protect him against the personal responsibilities which he had thus incurred.

But if I had committed a breach of privilege, it was the privilege of the Senate, and not of this House, which was violated. I was answerable there and not here. They had no right, as it seems to me, to prosecute me in these halls, nor have you the right in law or under the Constitution, as I respectfully submit, to take jurisdiction over offenses committed against them. The Constitution does not justify them in making such a request, nor this House in granting it.

If, unhappily, the day should ever come when sectional or party feeling should run so high as to control all other considerations of public duty or justice, how easy it will be to use such precedents for the excuse of arbitrary power, in either House, to expel members of the minority who may have rendered themselves obnoxious to the prevailing spirit in the House to which they belong.

Matters may go smoothly enough when one House asks the other to punish a member who is offensive to a majority of its own body; but how will it be when, upon a pretense of insulted dignity, demands are made of this House to expel a member who happens to run counter to its party predilections, or other demands which it may not be so agreeable to grant?

It could never have been designed by the Constitution of the United States to expose the two houses to such temptations to collision, or to extend so far the discretionary power which was given to either House to punish its own members for the violation of its rules and orders. Discretion has been said to be the law of the tyrant, and when exercised under the color of the law and under the influence of party dictation, it may and will become a terrible and insufferable despotism.

This House, however, it would seem, from the unmistakable tendency of its proceedings, takes a different view from that which I deliberately entertain in common with many others.

So far as public interests or constitutional rights are involved, I have now exhausted my means of defense. I may, then, be allowed to take a more personal view of the question at issue. The further prosecution of this subject, in the shape it has now assumed, may not only involve my friends, but the House itself, in agitations which might be unhappy in their consequences to the country.

If these consequences could be confined to myself individually, I think I am prepared and ready to meet them, here or elsewhere; and when I use this language I mean what I say. But others must not suffer for me. I have felt more on account of my two friends who have been implicated than for myself, for they have proven that "there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother." I will not constrain gentlemen to assume a responsibility on my account which possibly they would not run on their own.

Sir, I cannot, on my own account, assume the responsibility, in the face of the American people, of commencing a line of conduct which in my heart of hearts I believe would result in subverting the foundations of this government and in drenching this hall in blood. No act of mine, on my

personal account, shall inaugurate revolution; but when you, Mr. Speaker, return to your own home and hear the people of the great North—and they are a great people—speak of me as a bad man, you will do me the justice to say that a blow struck by me at this time would be followed by revolution—and this I know.

If I desired to kill the senator, why did not I do it? You all admit that I had him in my power. Let me tell the member from New Jersey that it was expressly to avoid taking life that I used an ordinary cane, presented to me by a friend in Baltimore nearly three months before its application to the "bare head" of the Massachusetts senator. I went to work very deliberately, as I am charged—and this is admitted—and speculated somewhat as to whether I should employ a horsewhip or a cowhide; but knowing that the senator was my superior in strength, it occurred to me that he might wrest it from my hand, and then—for I never attempt anything I do not perform—I might have been compelled to do that which I would have regretted the balance of my natural life.

The question has been asked in certain newspapers why I did not invite the senator to personal combat in the mode usually adopted. Well, sir, as I desire the whole truth to be known about the matter, I will for once notice a newspaper article on the floor of the House and answer here.

My answer is that the senator would not accept a message; and, having formed the unalterable determination to punish him, I believed that the offense of "sending a hostile message," superadded to the indictment for assault and battery, would subject me to legal penalties more severe than would be imposed for a simple assault and battery. That is my answer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nearly finished what I intended to say. If my opponents, who have pursued me with unparalleled bitterness, are satisfied with the present condition of this affair, I am. I return my thanks to my friends, and especially to those who are from non-slave-owning states, who have magnanimously sustained me and felt that it was a higher honor to themselves to be just in their judgment of a gentleman than to be a member of Congress for life. In taking my leave, I feel that it is proper

that I should say that I believe that some of the votes that have been cast against me have been extorted by an outside pressure at home, and that their votes do not express the feelings or opinions of the members who gave them.

To such of these who have given their votes and made their speeches on the constitutional principles involved, and without indulging in personal vilification, I owe my respect. But, sir, they have written me down upon the history of the country as worthy of expulsion, and in no unkindness I must tell them that for all future time my self-respect requires that I shall pass them as strangers.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I announce to you and to this House that I am no longer a member of the Thirty-fourth Congress.

LORD BROUGHAM

AGAINST PITT AND WAR WITH AMERICA

[Henry Brougham (Lord Brougham and Vaux), a British statesman and brilliant orator, was born in Edinburgh in 1779. His education was superintended by his uncle, the historian Robertson, and at twenty-two he was a proficient mathematician and physicist, a master of historical learning and of oratory, and the ablest man of letters in Edinburgh. He helped to found the Edinburgh Review, and in 1810 entered parliament. Here his supremacy in debate was long undisputed. His work as a reformer of legal abuses has left the stamp of his genius on the British statute book for all time. His oratory is displayed most brilliantly, perhaps, in his defense of Queen Caroline. On the death of the king he was made lord chancellor. Among his works may be mentioned "An Inquiry into the Colonial Policy of the European Powers," "The British Constitution," tracts against slavery, studies in biography, and collections of his speeches. He died in 1868. The speech given here was made at Liverpool at the outbreak of the War of 1812, and was directed chiefly against the policy of William Pitt in his advice to the British government regarding its dealings with the United States. The second speech was made in the House of Lords, 1838.]

GENTLEMEN: I told you last night when we were near the head of the poll, that I, for one at least, would neither lose heart in the conflict, nor lower my courage in fighting your battles, nor despair of the good cause, although we should be fifty, a hundred, or even two hundred behind our enemies. It has happened this day that we have fallen short of them, not quite by two hundred, but we have lost one hundred and seventy votes. I tell you this with the deepest concern, with feelings of pain and sorrow which I dare not trust myself in attempting to express. But I tell it you without any sensation approaching to despondency. This is the only feeling which I have not now present in my breast. I am overcome with your unutterable affection toward me and my cause. I feel a wonder

mingled with gratitude, which no language can even attempt to describe, at your faithful, unwearied, untamable exertions in my behalf of our common object. I am penetrated with an anxiety for its success, if possible more lively than any of yourselves can know, who are my followers in this mighty struggle—an anxiety cruelly increased by that which as yet you are ignorant of, though you are this night to hear it. To my distinguished friends who surround me, and connect me more closely with you, I am thankful beyond all expression. I am lost in admiration of the honest and courageous men amongst you who have resisted all threats as well as all bribes, and persevered in giving me their free, unbought voices. For those unhappy persons who have been scared by imminent fear on their own and their children's behalf from obeying the impulse of their conscience, I feel nothing of resentment—nothing but pity and compassion. Of those who have thus opposed us, I think as charitably as a man can think in such circumstances. For this great town (if it is indeed to be defeated in the contest, which I will not venture to suppose), for the country at large, whose cause we are upholding, whose fight we are fighting—for the whole manufacturing and trading interests—for all who love peace, all who have no profit in war—I feel moved by the deepest alarm lest our grand attempt may not prosper. All these feelings are in my heart at this moment—they are various, they are conflicting, they are painful, they are burdensome, but they are not overwhelming, and amongst them all—and I have swept round the whole range of which the human mind is susceptible—there is not one that bears the slightest resemblance to despair. I trust myself once more in your faithful hands; I fling myself again on you for protection; I call aloud to you to bear your own cause in your hearts; I implore of you to come forth in your own defense, for the sake of this vast town and its people, for the salvation of the middle and lower orders, for the whole industrial part of the whole country; I entreat you by your love of peace, by your hatred of oppression, by your weariness of burdensome and useless taxation, by yet another appeal to which those must lend an ear who have been deaf to all the rest: I ask it for your families, for your infants, if you would

avoid such a winter of horrors as the last. It is coming fast upon us; already it is near at hand; yet a few short weeks and we may be in the midst of those unspeakable miseries, the recollection of which now rends your very souls. If there is one freeman amongst this immense multitude who has not tendered his voice, and if he can be deaf to this appeal, if he can suffer the threats of our antagonists to frighten him away from the recollection of the last dismal winter, that man will not vote for me. But if I have the happiness of addressing one honest man amongst you, who has a care left for his wife and children, or for other endearing ties of domestic tenderness (and which of us is altogether without them?), that man will lay his hand on his heart when I now bid him do so, and with those little threats of present spite ringing in his ears, he will rather consult his fears of greater evil by listening to the dictates of his heart, when he casts a look toward the dreadful season through which he lately passed, and will come bravely forward to place those men in parliament whose whole efforts have been directed toward the restoration of peace and the revival of trade.

Do not, gentlemen, listen to those who tell you the cause of freedom is desperate; they are the enemies of that cause and of you; but listen to me—and I am one who has never yet deceived you—I say, then, that it will be desperate if you make no exertions to retrieve it. I tell you that your language alone can betray it, that it can only be made desperate through your despair. I am not a man to be cast down by temporary reverses, let them come upon me as thick and as swift and as sudden as they may. I am not he who is daunted by majorities in the outset of a struggle for worthy objects—else I should not now stand here before you to boast of triumphs won in your cause. If your champions had yielded to the force of numbers, of gold, of power, if defeat could have dismayed them, then would the African slave-trade never have been abolished; then would the cause of reform, which now bids fair to prevail over its enemies, have been long ago sunk amid the desertions of its friends; then would those prospects of peace have been utterly benighted, which I still devoutly cherish, and which even now brighten in our eyes; then

would the orders in council which I overthrew by your support, have remained a disgrace to the British name, and an eternal obstacle to our best interests. I no more despond now than I have done in the course of those sacred and glorious contentions, but it is for you to say whether to-morrow shall not make it my duty to despair. To-morrow is your last day; your last efforts must then be made; if you put forth your strength, the day is your own; if you desert it, it is lost. To win it, I shall be the first to lead you on and the last to forsake you.

Gentlemen, when I told you a little while ago that there were new and powerful reasons to-day for ardently desiring that our cause might succeed, I did not sport with you; yourselves shall now judge of them. I ask you: Is the trade with America of any importance to this great and thickly peopled town? [Cries of "Yes, yes!"] Is a continuance of the rupture with America likely to destroy that trade? [Loud cries of "It is, it is!"] Is there any man who would deeply feel it, if he heard that the rupture was at length converted into open war? Is there a man present who would not be somewhat alarmed if he supposed that we should have another year without the American trade? Is there any one of nerves so hardy, as calmly to hear that our government has given up all negotiation, abandoned all hopes of speedy peace with America? Then I tell that man to brace up his nerves; I bid you all be prepared to hear what touches you all equally. We are by this day's intelligence at war with America in good earnest; our government has at length issued letters of marque and reprisal against the United States. [Universal cries of "God help us, God help us!"] Aye, God help us! God of His infinite passion take pity on us! God help and protect this poor town, and this whole trading country!

Now, I ask you whether you will be represented in parliament by the men who have brought this grievous calamity on your heads, or by those who have constantly opposed the mad career which was plunging us into it? Whether you will trust the revival of your trade—the restoration of your livelihood—to them who have destroyed it, or to me whose counsels, if followed in time, would have averted this unnatural war, and left Liverpool flourishing in opu-

lence and peace? Make your choice, for it lies with yourselves which of us shall be commissioned to bring back commerce and plenty: they whose stubborn infatuation has chased those blessings away, or we, who are only known to you as the strenuous enemies of their miserable policy, the fast friends of your best interests.

Gentlemen, I stand up in this conquest against the friends and followers of Mr. Pitt, or, as they partially designate him, the immortal statesman, now no more. Immortal in the miseries of his devoted country! Immortal in the wounds of her bleeding liberties! Immortal in the cruel wars which sprang from his cold miscalculating ambition! Immortal in the intolerable taxes, the countless loads of debt which these wars have flung upon us—which the youngest man among us will not live to see the end of! Immortal in the triumph of our enemies, and the ruin of our allies, the costly purchase of so much blood and treasure! Immortal in the afflictions of England, and the humiliations of her friends, through the whole results of his twenty years' reign, from the first rays of favor with which a delighted court gilded his early apostasy, to the deadly glare which is at this instant cast upon his name by the burning metropolis of our last ally! But may no such immortality ever fall to my lot; let me rather live innocent and inglorious; and when at last I cease to serve you, and to feel for your wrongs, may I have an humble monument in some nameless stone, to tell that beneath it there rests from his labors in your service "an enemy of the immortal statesman—a friend of peace and of the people."

Friends, you must now judge for yourselves, and act accordingly. Against us and against you stand those who call themselves the successors of that man. They are the heirs of his policy; and if not of his immortality, too, it is only because their talents for the work of destruction are less transcendent than his. They are his surviving colleagues. His fury survives in them, if not his fire; and they partake of all his infatuated principles, if they have lost the genius that first made those principles triumphant. If you choose them for your delegates you know to what policy you lend your sanction—what men you exalt to power. Should you prefer me, your choice falls upon one

who, if obscure and unambitious, will at least give his own age no reason to fear him, or posterity to curse him—one whose proudest ambition it is to be deemed the friend of liberty and of peace.

SPEECH ON NEGRO EMANCIPATION

I do not think, my lords, that ever but once before in the whole course of my public life have I risen to address either house of parliament with the anxiety under which I labor at this moment. The occasion to which alone I can liken the present was when I stood up in the commons to expose the treatment of that persecuted missionary whose case gave birth to the memorable debate upon the condition of our negro brethren in the colonies—a debate happily so fruitful of results to the whole of this great cause.

But there is this difference between the two occasions to sustain my spirits now: that whereas at the former period the horizon was all wrapped in gloom through which not a ray of light pierced to cheer us, we have now emerged into a comparatively bright atmosphere, and are pursuing our journey full of hope. For this we have mainly to thank that important discussion and those eminent men who bore in it so conspicuous a part. And now I feel a greater gratification in being the means of enabling your lordships, by sharing in this great and glorious work, nay, by leading the way toward its final accomplishment, to increase the esteem in which you are held by your fellow citizens; or if, by any differences of opinion on recent measures, you may unhappily have lost any portion of the public favor, I know of no path more short, more sure, or more smooth, by which you may regain it. But I will not rest my right to your cooperation upon any such grounds as these. I claim your help by a higher title. I rely upon the justice of my cause—I rely upon the power of your consciences—I rely upon your duty to God and to man—I rely upon your consistency with yourselves—and, appealing to your own measure of 1833, if you be the same men in 1838, I call upon you to finish your own work and give at length a full effect to the wise and Christian principles which then guided your steps.

I rush at once into the midst of this great argument—I drag before you once more, but I trust for the last time, the African slave-trade, which I lately denounced here, and have so often elsewhere. On this we are all agreed. Whatever difference of opinion may exist on the question of slavery, on the slave-traffic there can be none. I am now furnished with a precedent which may serve for an example to guide us. On slavery we have always held that the colonial legislature could not be trusted; that, to use Mr. Canning's expression, you must beware of allowing the masters of slaves to make laws upon slavery. But upon the detestable traffic in slaves I can show you the proceeding of a colonial assembly which we should ourselves do well to adopt after their example. These masters of slaves, not to be trusted on that subject, have acted well and wisely on this. The legislature of Jamaica, owners of slaves, and representing all other slave-owners, feel that they also represent the poor negroes themselves; and they approach the throne, expressing themselves thankful—tardily thankful, no doubt—that the traffic has been for thirty years put down in our own colonies, and beseeching the sovereign to consummate the great work by the only effectual means—of having it declared piracy by the law of nations, as it is robbery and piracy and murder by the law of God! This address is precisely that which I desire your lordships to present to the same gracious sovereign.

I well remember how uneasy all were, looking forward to the first of August 1834, when the state of slavery was to cease, and I myself shared in those feelings of alarm when I contemplated the possible event of the vast but yet untried experiment. My fears proceeded first from the character of the masters. I knew the nature of man, fond of power, jealous of any interference with its exercise, uneasy at its being questioned, offended at its being regulated and constrained, averse, above all, to have it wrested from his hands, especially after it has been long enjoyed and its possession can hardly be severed from his nature.

But I also was aware of another and a worse part of human nature. I knew that whoso has abused power clings to it with a yet more convulsive grasp. I dreaded the nature of man, prone to hate whom he has injured; because

I knew that law of human weakness which makes the oppressor hate his victim, makes him who has injured never forgive, fills the wrongdoer with vengeance against those whose right it is to visit those injuries on his own head.

I knew that this abominable law of our evil nature was not confined to different races, contrasted hues, and strange features, but prevailed also between white man and white —for I never yet knew any one hate me but those whom I had served, and those who had done me some grievous injustice. Why then should I expect other feelings to burn within the planter's bosom, and govern his conduct toward the unhappy beings who had suffered so much and so long at his hands? But, on the part of the slaves, I was not without some anxiety when I considered the corrupting effects of that degrading system under which they had for ages groaned, and recognized the truth of the saying in the first and the earliest of profane poets, that "the day which makes a man a slave robs him of half his value."

I might well think that the West Indian slave offered no exception to this maxim, that the habit of compulsory labor might have incapacitated him from voluntary exertion; that overmuch toil might have made all work his aversion; that never having been accustomed to provide for his own wants, while all his supplies were furnished by others, he might prove unwilling or unfit to work for himself, the ordinary inducements to industry never having operated on his mind.

In a word, it seemed unlikely that long disuse of freedom might have rendered him too familiar with his chains to set a right value on liberty; or that, if he panted to be free, the sudden transition from the one state to the other, the instantaneous enjoyment of the object of his desires, might prove too strong for his uncultured understanding; might overset his principles, and render him dangerous to the public peace. Hence it was that I entertained some apprehensions of the event, and yielded reluctantly to the plan proposed of preparing the negroes for the enjoyment of perfect freedom by passing them through the intermediate state of indentured apprenticeship.

Let us now see the results of their sudden though partial liberation, and how far those fears have been realized; for

upon this must entirely depend the solution of the present question—whether or not it is safe now to complete the emancipation, which, if it only be safe, we have not the shadow of right any longer to withhold.

Well, then, let us see. The first of August came, the object of so much anxiety and so many predictions—that day so joyously expected by the poor slaves, as sorely dreaded by their hard taskmasters; and surely, if there ever was a picture interesting, even fascinating, to look upon, if there ever was a passage in a people's history that redounded to their eternal honor, if ever triumphant answer was given to all the scandalous calumnies for ages heaped upon an oppressed race, as if to justify the wrongs done them, that picture, and that passage, and that answer were exhibited in the uniform history of that auspicious day all over the islands of the Western Sea. Instead of the horizon being lit up with the lurid fires of rebellion, kindled by a sense of natural though lawless revenge, and the just resistance to intolerable oppression, the whole of that widespread scene was mildly illuminated with joy, contentment, peace, and good-will toward men.

No civilized nation, no people of the most refined character, could have displayed, after gaining a sudden and signal victory, more forbearance, more delicacy, in the enjoyment of their triumph, than these poor untutored slaves did upon the great consummation of all their wishes which they had just attained. Not a gesture or a look was seen to scare the eye; not a sound or a breath from the negro's lips was heard to grate on the ear of the planter. All was joy, congratulation, and hope. Everywhere were to be seen groups of these harmless folks assembled to talk over their good fortunes, to communicate their mutual feelings of happiness, to speculate on their future prospects. Finding that they were now free in name, they hoped soon to taste the reality of liberty. Feeling their fetters loosened, they looked forward to the day which would see them fall off, and the degrading marks which they left be effaced from their limbs.

But all this was accompanied with not a whisper that could give offense to the master by reminding him of the change. This delicate, calm, tranquil joy was alone to be

marked on that day over all the chain of the Antilles. Amusements there were none to be seen on that day—not even their simple pastimes by which they had been wont to beguile the hard hours of bondage, and which reminded that innocent people of the happy land of their forefathers, whence they had been torn by the hands of Christian and civilized men. The day was kept sacred as the festival of their liberation, for the negroes are an eminently pious race. Every church was crowded from early dawn with devout and earnest worshipers. Five or six times in the course of that memorable Friday were all those churches filled and emptied in succession by multitudes who came, not to give mouth worship or eye worship, but to render humble and hearty thanks to God for their freedom at length bestowed. In countries where the bounty of nature provokes the passions, where the fuel of intemperance is scattered with a profuse hand, I speak the fact when I tell that not one negro was seen in a state of intoxication. Three hundred and forty thousand slaves in Jamaica were at once set free on that day, and the peaceful festivity of those simple men was disturbed only on a single estate, in one parish, by the irregular conduct of three or four persons, who were immediately kept in order, and tranquillity was in one hour restored.

But the termination of slavery was to be an end of all labor; no man would work unless compelled; much less would any one work for hire. The cart-whip was to resound no more, and no more could exertion be obtained from the indolent African.

I set the past against these predictions. I have never been in the West Indies; I was one of those whom, under the name of reasoners, and theorists, and visionaries, all planters pitied for incurable ignorance on colonial affairs; one of those who were forbidden to meddle with matters of which they only could judge who had the practical knowledge of experienced men on the spot obtained.

Therefore I now appeal to the fact—and I also appeal to one who has been to the West Indies, is himself a planter, and was an eye-witness of the things upon which I call for his confirmatory testimony. It is to my noble friend [Lord Sligo] that I appeal. He knows, for he saw, that ever since slavery ceased there has been no want of inclination to work

in any part of Jamaica, and that labor for hire is now to be had without the least difficulty by all who can afford to pay wages, the apprentices cheerfully working for those who will pay them during the hours not appropriated to their masters.

My noble friend made an inquisition as to the state of this important matter in a large part of his government; and I have his authority for stating that in nine estates out of ten laborers for hire were to be had without the least difficulty.

Yet this was the people of whom we were told, with a confidence that set all contradiction at defiance, with an insulting pity for the ignorance of us who had no local experience, that without the lash there could be no work done, and that when it ceased to vex him, the African would sink into sleep. The prediction is found to have been ridiculously false; the negro peasantry is as industrious as our own, and wages furnish more effectual stimulus than the scourge.

Oh, but, said the men of colonial experience—the true practical men—this may do for some kinds of produce. Cotton may be planted, coffee may be picked, indigo may be manufactured—all these kinds of work the negro may probably be got to do; but at least the cane will cease to grow, the cane piece can no longer be hoed, nor the plant be hewn down, nor the juice boiled, and sugar will utterly cease out of the land.

Now let the man of experience stand forward—the practical man, the inhabitant of the colonies—I require that he now come forth with his prediction, and I meet him with the fact; let him but appear, and I answer for him, we shall hear him prophesy no more. Put to silence by the past, which even these confident men have not the courage to deny, they will at length abandon this untenable ground.

Twice as much sugar by the hour was found, on my noble friend's inquiry, to be made since the apprenticeship, as under the slave system, and of a far better quality; and one planter on a vast scale has said that with twenty free laborers he could do the work of a hundred slaves.

But linger not on the islands where the gift of freedom has been but half bestowed. Look at Antigua and Ber-

muda, where the wisdom and the virtue have been displayed of at once giving complete emancipation. To Montserrat the same appeal might have been made, but for the folly of the Upper House, which threw out the bill passed in the Assembly by the representatives of the planters. But in Antigua and in Bermuda, where for the last three years and a half there has not even been an apprentice—where all have been at once made as free as the peasantry of this country—the produce has increased, not diminished, and increased notwithstanding the accidents of bad seasons, droughts, and fires.

My lords, I have proved my case, and may now call for judgment. I have demonstrated every part of the proposition, which alone it is necessary that I should maintain, to prove the title of the apprentice to instant freedom from his taskmasters, because I have demonstrated that the liberation of the slave has been absolutely, universally safe—attended with not even inconvenience—nay, productive of ample benefits to his master. I have shown that the apprentice works without compulsion, and that the reward of wages is a better incentive than the punishment of the lash. I have proved that labor for hire may anywhere be obtained as it is wanted, and can be purchased. All the apprentices working extra hours for hire, and all the free negroes, wherever their emancipation has been complete, worked harder by much for the masters who have wherewithal to pay them, than the slave can toil for his owner, or the apprentice for his master.

Whether we look to the noble-minded colonies which have at once freed their slaves, or to those who still retain them in a middle and half-free condition, I have shown that the industry of the negro is undeniable, and that it is constant and productive in proportion as he is the director of its application and the master of its recompense. But I have gone a great deal further—I have demonstrated, by a reference to the same experience, the same unquestioned facts, that a more quiet, peaceful, inoffensive, innocent race is not to be found on the face of this earth than the Africans, not while dwelling in their own happy country, and enjoying freedom in a natural state under their own palm-trees and by their native streams, but after they have been

torn away from it, enslaved, and their nature perverted in your Christian land, barbarized by the policy of civilized states; their whole character disfigured, if it were possible to disfigure it; all their feelings corrupted, if you could have corrupted them. Every effort has been made to spoil the poor African, every source of wicked ingenuity exhausted to deprave his nature, all the incentives of misconduct placed around him by the fiendlike artifice of Christian civilized men, and his excellent nature has triumphed over all your arts; your unnatural culture has failed to make it bear the poisonous fruit that might well have been expected from such abominable husbandry; though enslaved and tormented, degraded and debased, as far as human industry could effect its purpose of making him bloodthirsty and savage, his gentle spirit has prevailed, and preserved, in spite of all your prophecies, aye, and of all your efforts, unbroken tranquillity over the whole Caribbean chain!

Have I not proved my case? I show you that the whole grounds of the arrangement of 1833, the very pretext for withholding complete emancipation—alleged incapacity for labor and risk of insurrection—utterly fail. I rely on your own records; I refer to that record which cannot be averred against. I plead the record of your own statute. On what ground does its preamble rest the necessity of the intermediate or apprentice state, all admitting that nothing but necessity would justify it?—

"Whereas, it is expedient that provision should be made, promoting the industry and securing the good conduct of the manumitted slaves."

Those are the avowed reasons for the measure, those its only defense. All men confessed that were it not for the apprehension of liberated slaves not working voluntarily, and not behaving peaceably, of slavery being found to have unfitted them for industry, and of a sudden transition to perfect freedom being fraught with danger to the peace of society, you had no right to make them indentured apprentices, and must at once get them wholly free. But the fear prevailed, which by the event I have now a right to call a delusion, and the apprenticeship was reluctantly agreed to.

The delusion went further. The planter succeeded in

persuading us that he would be a vast loser by the change, and we gave him twenty millions sterling money to indemnify him for the supposed loss. The fear is found to be utterly baseless, the loss is a phantom of the brain, a shape conjured up by the interested parties to frighten our weak minds, and the only reality in this mockery is the payment of that enormous sum to the crafty and fortunate magician for his incantations. The spell is dissolved, the charm is over, the unsubstantial fabric of calculating alarm, reared by the colonial body with our help, has been crushed to atoms, and its fragments scattered to the world.

And now, I ask, suppose it had been ascertained in 1833, when you made the apprenticeship law, that those alarms were absolutely groundless, the mere phantom of a sick brain, or contrivance of a sordid ingenuity, would a single voice have been raised in favor of the intermediate state? Would the words "indentured apprenticeship" ever have been pronounced? Would the man have been found endued with the courage to call for keeping the negro in chains one hour after he had been acknowledged entitled to his freedom?

My lords, I cannot better prove the absolute necessity of putting an immediate end to the state of apprenticeship than by showing what the victims of it are daily fated to endure. The punishments inflicted are of monstrous severity. The law is wickedly harsh; its execution is committed to hands that exasperate that cruelty. For the vague, undefined, undefinable offense of insolence, thirty-nine lashes; the same number for carrying a knife in the pocket; for cutting the shoot of a cane plant, fifty lashes, or three months' imprisonment in that most loathsome of all dungeons, a West Indian jail.

There seems to have prevailed at all times among the lawgivers of the slave colonies a feeling of which I grieve to say those of the mother country have partaken: that there is something in the nature of a slave, something in the disposition of the African race, something in the habits of those hapless victims of our crimes, our cruelties, and frauds, which requires a peculiar harshness of treatment from their rulers, and makes what in other men's cases we call justice and mercy cruelty to society, and injustice to

the law in theirs, inducing us to visit with the extremity of rigor in the African what, if done by our own tribes, would be slightly visited, or not at all, as though there were in the negro nature something so obdurate that no punishment with which they can be punished would be too severe.

Prodigious, portentous injustice! As if we had a right to blame any but ourselves for whatever there may be of harshness or cunning in our slaves; as if we were entitled to visit upon him that disposition, were it obdurate—those habits, were they insubordinate—those propensities, were they dishonest (all of which I deny them to be, and every day's experience justifies my denial); but were those charges as true as they are foully slanderous and absolutely false, is it for us to treat our victims harshly for failings or for faults with which our treatment of him has corrupted and perverted his nature, instead of taking to ourselves the blame, punishing ourselves at least with self-abasement, and atoning with deepest shame for having implanted vice in a pure soil?

If some capricious despot were, in the career of ordinary tyranny, to tax his pampered fancy to produce something more monstrous, more unnatural than himself; were he to graft the thorn upon the vine, or place the dove among vultures to be reared, much as we might marvel at this freak of a perverted appetite, we should marvel still more if we saw tyranny, even its own measure of proverbial unreasonableness, and complain because the grape was not gathered from the thorn, or because the dove so trained had a thirst for blood. Yet this is the unnatural caprice, this the injustice, the gross, the foul, the outrageous, the monstrous, the incredible injustice of which we are daily and hourly guilty toward the whole of the ill-fated African race!

My lords, we fill up the measure of this injustice by executing laws wickedly conceived in a yet more atrocious spirit of cruelty. Our whole punishments smell of blood. Let the treadmill stop from the weary limbs and exhausted frames of the sufferers no longer having the power to press it down the requisite number of turns in a minute, the lash instantly resounds through the mansion of woe! Let the stone spread out to be broken not crumble fast enough beneath the arms already scarred, flayed, and wealed by

the whip, again the scourge tears afresh the half-healed flesh!

My lords, I have had my attention directed within the last two hours to the new mass of papers laid on our table from the West Indies. The bulk I am averse to break, but a sample I have culled from its hateful contents. Eleven females were punished by severe flogging, and then put on the treadmill, where they were compelled to ply until exhausted nature could do no more. When faint and about to fall off, they were suspended by the arms in such a manner that has been described to me by a most respectable eye-witness of similar scenes, but not so suspended as that the mechanism could revolve clear of their person; for the wheel at each turn bruised and galled their legs, till their sufferings had reached the pitch when life can no longer even glimmer in the socket of the weary frame. In the course of a few days these wretched beings "languished," to use the language of our law—that law which is so constantly and systematically violated—and, "languishing, died."

Ask you if crimes like these, murderous in their legal nature as well as frightful in their aspect, passed unnoticed; if inquiry was neglected to be made respecting those deaths in a prison? No such thing! The forms of justice were on this head peremptory even in the West Indies, and those forms, the handmaids of justice, were present, though their sacred mistress was far away. The coroner duly attended, his jury were regularly empaneled; eleven inquisitions were made in order, and eleven verdicts returned. Murder? Manslaughter? Misdemeanor? Misconduct? No! but "Died by the visitation of God"! Died by the visitation of God! A lie!—a perjury!—a blasphemy!

The visitation of God! Yes; for it is among the most awful of these visitations by which the inscrutable purposes of His will are mysteriously accomplished, that He sometimes arms the wicked with power to oppress the guiltless; and, if there be any visitation more dreadful than another, any which more tries the faith and vexes the reason of erring mortals, it is when heaven showers down upon the earth the plague—not of scorpions, or pestilence, or famine, or war—but of unjust judges or perjured jurors—wretches

who pervert the law to wreak their personal vengeance or compass their sordid ends, and forswear themselves on the gospels of God, to the end that injustice may prevail and the innocent be destroyed:—

"Sed nos immensum spatiis confecimus æquor,
Et jam tempus equis spumantia solvere colla." *

I hasten to a close. There remains little to add. It is, my lords, with a view to prevent such enormities as I have feebly pictured before you, to correct the administration of justice, to secure the comforts of the negroes, to restrain the cruelty of the tormentors, to amend the discipline of the prisons, to arm the governors with local authority over the police—it is with those views that I have formed the first five of the resolutions now upon your table, intending they should take effect during the very short interval of a few months which must elapse before the sixth shall give complete liberty to the slave.

I entirely concur in the observation of Mr. Burke, repeated and more happily expressed by Mr. Canning, that the masters of slaves are not to be trusted with making laws upon slavery; that nothing they do is ever found effectual; and that if by some miracle they even chance to enact a wholesome regulation, it is always found to want what Mr. Burke calls "the executory principle"; it fails to execute itself.

But experience has shown that when the lawgivers of the colonies find you are firmly determined to do your duty, they anticipate you by doing theirs. Thus, when you announced the bill for amending the Emancipation Act, they outstripped you in Jamaica, and passed theirs before you could reach them.

Let, then, your resolutions only show you to be in good earnest now, and I have no doubt a corresponding disposition will be evinced on the other side of the Atlantic. These improvements are, however, only to be regarded as temporary expedients, as mere palliatives of an enormous mischief for which the only efficient remedy is that com-

* "We have traversed the boundless spaces of the desert,
And the time has come to unyoke our foaming steeds."

plete emancipation which I have demonstrated by the unerring and incontrovertible evidence of facts, as well as the clearest deductions of reason, to be safe and practicable, and, therefore, proved to be our imperative duty at once to proclaim.

From the instant that glad sound is wafted across the ocean, what a blessed change begins; what an enchanting prospect unfolds itself! The African, placed on the same footing with other men, becomes in reality our fellow citizen —to our feelings, as well as in his own nature, our equal, our brother. No difference of origin or color can now prevail to keep the two castes apart. The negro, master of his own labor—only induced to lend his assistance if you make it his interest to help you, yet that aid being absolutely necessary to preserve your existence—becomes an essential portion of the community, nay, the very portion upon which the whole must lean for support.

This insures him all his rights; this makes it not only no longer possible to keep him in thraldom, but places him in a complete and intimate union with the whole mass of colonial society. Where the driver and the jailer once bore sway, the lash resounds no more, nor does the clank of the chain any more fall upon the troubled ear; the fetter has ceased to gall the vexed limb, and the very mark disappears which for a while it had left. All races and colors run together the same glorious race of improvement. Peace unbroken, harmony uninterrupted, calm unruffled, reign in mansion and in field, in the busy street and the fertile valley, where Nature, with the lavish hand she extends under the tropical sun, pours forth all her bounty profusely, because received in the lap of cheerful industry, not extorted by hands cramped with bonds.

So now the fulness of time is come for at length discharging our duty to the African captive. I have demonstrated to you that everything is ordered—every previous step taken—all safe, by experience shown to be safe, for the long-desired consummation. The time has come, the trial has been made, the hour is striking; you have no longer a pretext for hesitation or faltering or delay. The slave has shown, by four years' blameless behavior and devotion to the pursuits of peaceful industry, that he is as

fit for his freedom as any English peasant, aye, or any lord whom I now address.

I demand his rights; I demand his liberty without stint. In the name of justice and of law, in the name of reason, in the name of God, who has given you no right to work injustice, I demand that your brother be no longer trampled upon as your slave! I make my appeal to the commons, who represent the free people of England, and I require at their hands the performance of that condition for which they paid so enormous a price—that condition which all their constituents are in breathless anxiety to see fulfilled! I appeal to this House! Hereditary judges of the first tribunal in the world, to you I appeal for justice! Patrons of all the arts that humanize mankind, under your protection I place humanity herself! To the merciful sovereign of a free people, I call aloud for mercy to the hundreds of thousands for whom half a million of her Christian sisters have cried out; I ask that their cry may not have risen in vain. But, first, I turn my eye to the Throne of all justice, and, devoutly humbling myself before Him who is of purer eyes than to behold such vast iniquities, I implore that the curse hovering over the head of the unjust and the oppressor be averted from us, that your hearts may be turned to mercy, and that over all the earth His will may at length be done!

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

ON THE INCOME TAX

[William Jennings Bryan, an American political leader, was born in Illinois in 1860. He received a collegiate education in his native state and studied law, which he practiced for some years in Illinois, and then settled in Nebraska. He was successful in building up a practice, and equally successful in acquiring an influence in political affairs. He was elected to Congress as an advocate of bimetalism for two terms, but the crisis in the Democratic party, precipitated by its internal dissensions over the financial question, prevented his rise to a position of leadership until 1896. In that year the Democratic National Convention placed him in nomination for the presidency. He was defeated, notwithstanding the fact that he had the nomination of the People's Party, supposed to be powerful in some of the Western states. Four years later he was again defeated for the presidency as the Democratic and Populist candidate. The following speech was made in the House of Representatives in 1894, and was considered an eloquent presentation of the arguments in favor of an income tax.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: If this were a mere contest in oratory, no one would be presumptuous enough to dispute the prize with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Cockran]; but clad in the armor of a righteous cause, I dare oppose myself to the shafts of his genius, believing that "pebbles of truth" will be more effective than the "javelin of error," even when hurled by the giant of the Philistines. [Applause.] What is this bill which has brought forth the vehement attack to which we have just listened? It is a bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, as the complement of the tariff bill. It, together with the tariff measure already considered, provides the necessary revenue for the support of the government. The point of attack is the income tax, individual and corporation (which is expected to raise about $30,000,-

000), and to that I will devote the few minutes which are allowed for closing the debate.

The gentleman from New York insists that sufficient revenue will be raised from the tariff schedules, together with the present internal revenue taxes, and that it is therefore unnecessary to seek new objects for taxation. In this opinion he is not supported by the other members of the committee, and we have been constrained to follow our own judgment rather than his. The internal revenue bill which is now pending as an amendment to the tariff bill imposes a tax of 2 per cent. upon the net incomes of corporations, and in the case of corporations no exemption is allowed.

I need not give all the reasons which led the committee to recommend this tax, but will suggest two of the most important. The stockholder in a corporation limits his liability. When the statute creating the corporation is fully complied with, the individual stockholder is secure, except to the extent fixed by the statute, whereas the entire property of the individual is ordinarily liable for his debts. Another reason is that corporations enjoy certain privileges and franchises. Some are given the right of eminent domain, while others, such as street-car companies, are given the right to use the streets of the city—a franchise which increases in value with each passing year. Corporations occupy the time and attention of our federal courts and enjoy the protection of the Federal government, and as they do not ordinarily pay taxes, the committee felt justified in proposing a light tax upon them.

Some gentlemen have accused the committee of showing hostility to corporations. But, Mr. Chairman, we are not hostile to corporations; we simply believe that these creatures of the law, these fictitious persons, have no higher or dearer rights than the persons of flesh and blood whom God created and placed upon His footstool. [Applause.] The bill also imposes a tax of 2 per cent. upon individual incomes in excess of $4,000. We have proposed the maximum of exemption and the minimum of rate. The principle is not new in this country. For nearly ten years, during and after the war, an income tax was levied, varying from 2½ to 10 per cent., while the exemption ranged from $600 to

$2,000. In England the rate for 1892 was a little more than 2 per cent., the amount exempt $750, with an additional deduction of $600 on incomes of less than $2,000. The tax has been in force there in various forms for more than fifty years.

In Prussia the income tax has been in operation for about twenty years; incomes under 900 marks are exempt, and the tax ranges from less than 1 per cent. to about 4 per cent., according to the size of the income.

Austria has tried the income tax for thirty years, the exemption being about $113, and the rate ranging from 8 per cent. up to 20 per cent.

A large sum is collected from an income tax in Italy; only incomes under $77.20 are exempt, and the rate runs up as high as 13 per cent. on some incomes.

In the Netherlands the income tax has been in operation since 1823. At present, incomes under $260 are exempt, and the rate ranges from 2 per cent. to 3 1–5 per cent., the latter rate being paid upon incomes in excess of $3,280.

In Zurich, Switzerland, the income tax has been in operation for more than half a century. Incomes under $100 are exempt, and the rate ranges from about 1 per cent. to almost 8 per cent., according to the size of the income.

It will thus be seen that the income tax is no new device, and it will also be noticed that the committee has proposed a tax lighter in rate and more liberal in exemption than that imposed in any of the countries named.

If I were consulting my own preference I would rather have a graduated tax, and I believe that such a tax could be defended not only upon principle, but upon grounds of public policy as well; but I gladly accept this bill as offering a more equitable plan for making up the deficit in our revenues than any other which has been proposed. The details of the bill will be discussed to-morrow under the five-minute rule, and any necessary changes can be made.

The committee presents the bill after careful consideration, but will cheerfully accept any changes which the wisdom of the House may suggest. The bill not only exempts from taxation, but from annoyance as well, every person whose income is below $3,500. This is an impor-

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

Photogravure after a photograph

tant feature of the bill. In order to guard against fraud the bill provides that every person having an income of more than $3,500 shall make a return under oath, but no tax is collected unless the net income exceeds $4,000. The bill also provides severe penalties to restrain the tax-collector from disclosing any information gained from the returns made by citizens.

And now, Mr. Chairman, let us consider the objections which have been made. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Bartlett] who addressed the House this forenoon, spent some time in trying to convince us that, while the Supreme Court had without dissent affirmed the constitutionality of an income tax, yet it might at some future time reverse the decision, and that, therefore, this bill ought to be rejected. This question has been settled beyond controversy. The principle has come before the court on several occasions, and the decisions have always sustained the constitutionality of the income tax. [Hylton *vs.* United States, 3 Dall., 171; Deasie Bank *vs.* Fenno, 8 Wall., 533; Scholey *vs.* Rew, 23 Wall., 331; Pacific Insurance Company *vs.* Soule, 7 Wall., 433.]

In Springer *vs.* United States [102 United States, 586] the question was directly raised upon the law in force from 1863 to 1873, and the court held that the income tax as then collected was not a direct tax within the meaning of the Constitution, and therefore need not be apportioned among the states according to their population.

But gentlemen have denounced the income tax as class legislation, because it will affect more people in one section of the country than in another. Because the wealth of the country is, to a large extent, centered in certain cities and states does not make a bill sectional which imposes a tax in proportion to wealth. If New York and Massachusetts pay more tax under this law than other states, it will be because they have more taxable incomes within their borders. And why should not those sections pay most which enjoy most?

The census shows that the population of Massachusetts increased less than half a million between 1880 and 1890, while the assessed value of her property increased more than half a billion during the same period. The population

of New York increased about 900,000 between 1880 and 1890, while the assessed value of the property increased more than $1,100,000,000. On the other hand, while the population of Iowa and Kansas combined increased more than 700,000, their assessed valuation increased only a little more than $300,000,000. This bill is not in the line of class legislation, nor can it be regarded as legislation against a section, for the rate of taxation is the same on every income over $4,000, whether its possessor lives upon the Atlantic coast, in the Mississippi Valley, or on the Pacific slope. I only hope that we may in the future have more farmers in the agricultural districts whose incomes are large enough to tax. [Applause.]

But the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cockran] has denounced as unjust the principle underlying this tax. It is hardly necessary to read authorities to the House. There is no more just tax upon the statute books than the income tax, nor can any tax be proposed which is more equitable; and the principle is sustained by the most distinguished writers on political economy.

Adam Smith says:—

> The subjects of every state ought to contribute to the support of the government, as nearly as possible in proportion to their respective abilities; that is, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the state. In the observation or neglect of this maxim consists what is called the equality or inequality of taxation.

The income tax is the only one which really fulfils this requirement. But it is said that we single out some person with a large income and make him pay more than his share. And let me call attention here to a fatal mistake made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Cockran]. You who listened to his speech would have thought that the income tax was the only federal tax proposed; you would have supposed that it was the object of this bill to collect the entire revenue from an income tax. The gentleman forgets that the pending tariff bill will collect upon imports more than one hundred and twenty millions of dollars—nearly ten times as much as we propose to collect from the individual income tax. Everybody knows that a

tax upon consumption is an unequal tax, and that the poor man by means of it pays far out of proportion to the income which he enjoys.

I read the other day in the New York "World"—and I gladly join in ascribing praise to that great daily for its courageous fight upon this subject in behalf of the common people—a description of the home of the richest woman in the United States. She owns property estimated at $60,000,000, and enjoys an income which can scarcely be less than $3,000,000, yet she lives at a cheap boarding-house, and only spends a few hundred dollars a year. That woman, under your indirect system of taxation, does not pay as much toward the support of the Federal government as a laboring man whose income of $500 is spent upon his family. [Applause.]

Why, sir, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cockran] said that the poor are opposed to this tax because they do not want to be deprived of participation in it, and that taxation instead of being a sign of servitude is a badge of freedom. If taxation is a badge of freedom, let me assure my friend that the poor people of this country are covered all over with the insignia of freemen. [Applause.]

Notwithstanding the exemption proposed by this bill, the people whose incomes are less than $4,000 will still contribute far more than their just share to the support of the government. The gentleman says that he opposes this tax in the interest of the poor! Oh, sirs, is it not enough to betray the cause of the poor—must it be done with a kiss? [Applause.]

Would it not be fairer for the gentleman to fling his burnished lance full in the face of the toiler, and not plead for the great fortunes of this country under cover of the poor man's name? [Applause.] The gentleman also tells us that the rich will welcome this tax as a means of securing greater power. Let me call your attention to the resolutions passed by the New York Chamber of Commerce. I wonder how many poor men have membership in that body! Here are the resolutions passed at a special meeting called for the purpose. The newspaper account says:—

Resolutions were adopted declaring "the proposal to impose an income tax is unwise, unpolitic, and unjust for the following reasons:—

"First. Experience during our late war demonstrated that an income tax was inquisitorial and odious to our people, and only tolerated as a war measure, and was abrogated by universal consent as soon as the condition of the country permitted.

"Second. Experience has also shown that it is expensive to put in operation; that it cannot be fairly collected, and is an unjust distribution of the burdens of taxation and promotes evasions of the law.

"Third. The proposal to exempt incomes under $4,000 is purely class legislation, which is socialistic and vicious in its tendency, and contrary to the traditions and principles of republican government."

Still another resolution was adopted declaring "that in addition to an internal revenue tax the necessary expenses of the government should be collected through the custom-house, and that the senators and representatives in Congress from the State of New York be requested to strenuously oppose all attempts to reimpose an income tax upon the people of this country."

They say that the income tax was "only tolerated as a war measure, and was abrogated by universal consent as soon as the condition of the country permitted." Abrogated by universal consent! What refreshing ignorance from such an intelligent source! If their knowledge of other facts recited in those resolutions is as accurate as that statement, how much weight their resolutions ought to have! Why, sir, there never has been a day since the war when a majority of the people of the United States opposed an income tax. It was only repealed by one vote in the Senate, and when under consideration was opposed by such distinguished Republicans as Senator Sherman, of Ohio; Senator Morton, of Indiana; and Senator Howe, of Wisconsin. It was also opposed in the House by Mr. Voorhees, and by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Holman]——

Mr. Patterson.—And by Roger Q. Mills.

Mr. Bryan.—Yes, by Roger Q. Mills, I am informed, and a host of others. Not only did the senators mentioned oppose repeal, but they spoke with emphasis in favor of the justice of an income tax.

Senator Sherman said:—

The Senator from New York and the Senator from Massachusetts have led off in declaring against the income tax. They have declared it to be invidious. Well, sir, all taxes are invidious. They say it is inquisitorial. Well, sir, there never was a tax in the world that was not inquisitorial.

The least inquisitorial of all is the income tax.

I hope that, after full discussion, nobody will vote for striking out the income tax. It seems to me to be one of the plainest propositions in the world. Put before the people of the United States the question whether the property of this country cannot stand a tax of $20,000,000, when the consumption of the people stands a tax of $300,000,000, and I think they will quickly answer it. The property holders of the country came here and demanded the repeal of the only tax that bears upon their property, when we have to tax everything for the food of the poor, the clothing of the poor, and all classes of our people $300,000,000.

There never was so just a tax levied as the income tax.

There is no objection that can be urged against the income tax that I cannot point to in every tax.

Writers on political economy, as well as our own sentiments of what is just and right, teach us that a man ought to pay taxes according to his income and in no other way.

Could language be stronger or more pertinent to the present discussion?

Senator Howe said:—

There is not a tax on the books so little felt, so absolutely unfelt in the payment of it, as this income tax by the possessors of the great fortunes upon which it falls.

There is not a poor man in this country, not a laborer in this country, but what contributes more than 3, more than 10, more than 20 per cent. of all his earnings to the Treasury of the United States under those very laws against which I am objecting; and now we are invited to increase their contributions, and to release these trifling contributions which we have been receiving from incomes heretofore.

Senator Morton said:—

The state taxation in Indiana, and, I undertake to say, of every state in the Union, has in it every inquisitorial feature that the income tax has.

The income tax is of all others the most equitable, because it is the truest measure that has yet been found of the productive property of the country.

The Chamber of Commerce, in its anxiety to defeat this tax, has distorted the facts of history, and yet the gentleman from New York says that the rich favor the law. If, sirs, they favor the law, why is it that the opposition to the law comes only from the districts in which the wealthy live?

Are the representatives from those districts unwilling to do what their people want done, and is it necessary for the great agricultural districts to come here and force upon the rich districts of the United States a tax which the rich love so much?

The gentleman from New York says that this tax is inquisitorial, that it pries into a man's private business. I sent to New York and obtained from the city chamberlain copies of assessment blanks used. The chamberlain writes:—

> The matter of assessing personal taxes is arrived at by interrogation of the persons assessed by either of the commissioners, which is a very rigorous cross-examination in reference to the amount of personal property they have, and reductions are only made by an affidavit asking for the same and sworn to before a tax commissioner of this county.

The citizen, after giving in detail his stock in various banks, makes oath that—

> the full value of all personal property, exclusive of said bank shares owned by deponent (and not exempt by law from taxation) on the second Monday in January, 189—, did not exceed $——; that the just debts owing by deponent on said date amounted to $——, and that no portion of such debts has been deducted from the assessment of any personal property of deponent, other than said bank shares, or has been used as an offset in the adjustment of any assessment for personal property, whether in this or in any other county or state, for the year 189—, or incurred in the purchase of non-taxable property or securities, or for the purpose of evading taxation.

Is the proposed tax any more inquisitorial than that?

In Connecticut the citizen is required to give the number and value of various domestic animals, the number of watches, the value of jewelry, household furniture, library, etc.; also bonds, stocks, money at interest, and money on deposit. Is the proposed tax any more inquisitorial than that?

In Nebraska the citizen is compelled to give the number and value of all domestic animals, watches, diamonds, jewelry, money, credits, etc., and what is true in Nebraska is true generally of all the states. Is an income tax more inquisitorial than these taxes upon personal property? I insist, sirs, that the income tax provided for in this bill is

less inquisitorial in its nature than the taxes which are found in every state in the Union.

But they say that the income tax invites perjury; that the man who has a large income will swear falsely, and thus avoid the payment of the tax; and, indeed, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Walker] admitted that his district was full of such people, and he said that our districts were, too. I suppose these constituents whom he accuses of perjury are expected to pat him on the back when he goes home, and brag about the compliment he paid them. [Laughter and applause.]

If there is a man in my district whose veracity is not worth two cents on the dollar, who will perjure himself to avoid the payment of a just tax imposed by law, I am going to wait until he pleads guilty before I make that charge against him. [Laughter and applause.]

They say that we must be careful and not invite perjury. Why, sirs, this government has too much important business on hand to spend its time trying to bolster up the morality of men who cannot be trusted to swear to their incomes. And let me suggest that gentlemen who come to this House and tell us that their districts are full of such persons are treading upon dangerous ground. If a man will hold up his hand to Heaven and perjure his soul to avoid a two per cent. tax due to his government, how can you trust such a man when he goes into court and testifies in a case in which he has a personal interest?

If your districts are full of perjurers, if your districts are full of men who violate with impunity not only the laws but their oaths, do you not raise a question as to the honesty of the methods by which they have accumulated their fortunes? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Instead of abandoning just measures for fear somebody will perjure himself, let them be enacted into law, and then if any one perjures himself we can treat him like any other felon, and punish him for his perjury. [Applause.]

But gentlemen say that some people will avoid the tax, and that therefore it is unfair to the people who pay. What law is fully obeyed? Why are criminal courts established, except to punish people who violate the laws which society has made? The man who pays his tax need not concern

himself about the man who avoids it, unless, perhaps, he is willing to help prosecute the delinquent. The man who makes an honest return and complies with the law pays no more than the rate prescribed, and if the possessors of large fortunes escape by fraud the payment of one half their income tax, they will still contribute far more than they do now to support the Federal Government, and to that extent relieve from burdens those who now pay their share.

The gentleman from New York is especially indignant because incomes under $4,000 are exempt. Why, sir, this is not a new principle in legislation. The exemption of very small incomes might be justified on the ground that the cost of collection would exceed the amount collected, but it is not necessary to urge this defense. The propriety of making certain exemptions is everywhere recognized. So far as I have been able to investigate, every country which now imposes or has imposed an income tax has exempted small incomes from taxation. Nearly, if not all of our states exempt certain kinds of property, or property to a certain amount. If an exception tends toward socialism, as urged by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cockran] and the Chamber of Commerce, is it possible that socialism has taken possession of the states of New York and Connecticut?

I find in the assessment blank used in New York the words "and not exempt by law from taxation," indicating that some property is exempt. The gentleman from New York had better eradicate this evidence of socialism, as he calls it, from the statutes of his own state before he denounces us for following the example set by New York.

I find from the Connecticut assessment blank that farming utensils to the value of $200, mechanics' tools to the value of $200, watches and jewelry to the value of $25, musical instruments to the value of $25, household furniture to the value of $500, libraries to the value of $200, and money on deposit to the amount of $100, are all exempt from the personal property tax. What a firm hold socialism seems to have gained upon Connecticut!

The gentlemen who are so fearful of socialism when the poor are exempted from an income tax view with indifference those methods of taxation which give the rich a sub-

stantial exemption. They weep more because fifteen millions are to be collected from the incomes of the rich than they do at the collection of three hundred millions upon the goods which the poor consume. And when an attempt is made to equalize these burdens, not fully, but partially only, the people of the South and West are called anarchists.

I deny the accusation, sirs. It is among the people of the South and West, on the prairies and in the mountains, that you find the stanchest supporters of government and the best friends of law and order.

You may not find among these people the great fortunes which are accumulated in cities, nor will you find the dark shadows which these fortunes throw over the community; but you will find those willing to protect the rights of property, even while they demand that property shall bear its share of taxation. You may not find among them so much of wealth, but you will find men who are not only willing to pay their taxes to support the government, but are willing whenever necessary to offer up their lives in its defense.

These people, sir, whom you call anarchists because they ask that the burdens of government shall be equally borne, these people have ever borne the cross on Calvary and saved their country with their blood.

Mr. George K. Holmes, of the census department, in an article recently published in the "Political Science Quarterly," gives some tables showing the unequal distribution of property, and says:—

> Otherwise stated, 91 per cent. of the 12,690,152 families of the country own no more than about 23 per cent. of the wealth, and 9 per cent. of the families own about 71 per cent. of the wealth.

Is it unfair or unjust that the burden of taxation shall be equalized between these two classes? Who is it most needs a navy? Is it the farmer who plods along behind the plow upon his farm, or is it the man whose property is situated in some great seaport where it could be reached by an enemy's guns? Who demands a standing army? Is it the poor man as he goes about his work, or is it the capitalist who wants that army to supplement the local government in protecting his property when he enters into a contest

with his employees? For whom are the great expenses of the Federal government incurred? Why, sir, when we ask that this small pittance shall be contributed to the expenses of the Federal government, we are asking less than is just rather than more. But the gentleman from New York fears that this amendment will embarrass the bill, and denounces the action of the caucus as treason.

It has never been the policy of the party to control a member's vote upon the merits of a question by a caucus, and the caucus recently held was not to determine how any one should vote, but simply to decide whether the internal revenue bill should be attached to the tariff bill or brought up subsequently as an independent measure. When a member comes to represent a constituency upon this floor, he is responsible to his conscience and to his constituency, and to them alone. But gentlemen will remember that no revenue bill exactly meets the wishes of any one member, and that we are continually compelled to choose between something not wholly desirable and something else less desirable still.

Individual Democrats have opposed various tariff schedules, and have opposed them honestly; but the House, in committee of the whole, has agreed upon a certain tariff policy, and the tariff bill as agreed upon leaves a deficit in the revenue. This deficit must be made up, and it must be made up in that way which is most agreeable to a majority of the House. If the pending amendment providing for the income tax is adopted by the House, it then becomes a part of the bill, and upon the final vote we shall be called upon to choose between the present law and a tariff reform measure embodying an income tax. Each one must decide his course for himself.

If any Democrat who has advocated tariff reform and denounced the present law is willing to go back to his people and say, "Yes, the McKinley tariff is a crime; its loads are heavy and its oppression great; but I choose to make you bear the injustice still, rather than bring you a relief accompanied by a light tax upon incomes," he can settle the matter with those whom he represents. If there be those who are willing to see their fellows oppressed "with burdens grievous to be borne," and yet "touch not the

burdens" lest wealth may be displeased, the rest of us can still carry on the work of tariff reform, even if in so doing we must impose a tax which embodies the just principle observed by Him who "tempers the wind to the shorn lamb."

And, Mr. Chairman, I desire to here enter my protest against the false political economy taught by our opponents in this debate and against the perversion of language which we have witnessed. They tell us that it is better to consider expediency than equity in the adjustment of taxation. They tell us that it is right to tax consumption, and thus make the needy pay out of all proportion to their means, but that it is wrong to make a slight compensation for this system by exempting small incomes from an income tax. They tell us that it is wise to limit the use of the necessaries of life by heavy indirect taxation, but that it is vicious to lessen the enjoyment of the luxuries of life by a light tax upon large incomes. They tell us that those who make the load heaviest upon persons least able to bear it are distributing the burdens of government with an impartial hand, but that those who insist that each citizen should contribute to government in proportion as God has prospered him are blinded by prejudice against the rich. They call that man a statesman whose ear is turned to catch the slightest pulsations of a pocketbook, and denounce as a demagogue any one who dares to listen to the heart-beat of humanity. [Applause.]

Let me refer again, in conclusion, to the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cockran], that the rich people of this city favor the income tax. In a letter which appeared in the New York "World" on the seventh of this month, Ward McAllister, the leader of the "Four Hundred," enters a very emphatic protest against the income tax. [Derisive laughter.] Here is an extract:—

In New York City and Brooklyn the local taxation is ridiculously high, in spite of the virtuous protest to the contrary by the officials in authority. Add to this high local taxation an income tax of 2 per cent. on every income exceeding $4,000, and many of our best people will be driven out of the country. An impression seems to exist in the minds of our great Democratic Solons in Congress that a rich man would give up all his wealth for the privilege of living in this country. A very

short period of income taxation would show these gentlemen their mistake. The custom is growing from year to year for rich men to go abroad and live, where expenses for the necessaries and luxuries of life are not nearly so high as they are in this country. The United States, in spite of their much boasted natural resources, could not maintain such a strain for any considerable length of time. [Laughter.]

But whither will these people fly? If their tastes are English, "quite English, you know," and they stop in London, they will find a tax of more than 2 per cent. assessed upon incomes; if they look for a place of refuge in Prussia, they will find an income tax of 4 per cent.; if they search for seclusion among the mountains of Switzerland, they will find an income tax of 8 per cent.; if they seek repose under the sunny skies of Italy, they will find an income tax of more than 12 per cent.; if they take up their abode in Austria, they will find a tax of 20 per cent. I repeat, whither will they fly?

Mr. Weadock.—The gentleman will allow me to suggest that at Monte Carlo such a man would not have to pay any tax at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. Bryan.—Then, Mr. Chairman, I presume to Monte Carlo he would go, and that there he would give up to the wheel of fortune all the wealth of which he would not give a part to support the government which enabled him to accumulate it. [Laughter and applause.]

Are there really any such people in this country? Of all the mean men I have ever known, I have never known one so mean that I would be willing to say of him that his patriotism was less than 2 per cent. deep. [Laughter and applause.]

There is not a man whom I would charge with being willing to expatriate himself rather than contribute from his abundance to the support of the government that protects him.

If "some of our best people" prefer to leave the country rather than pay a tax of 2 per cent., God pity the worst. [Laughter.]

If we have people who value free government so little that they prefer to live under monarchical institutions, even without an income tax, rather than live under the stars and stripes and pay a 2 per cent. tax, we can better afford to

lose them and their fortunes than risk the contaminating influence of their presence. [Applause.]

I will not attempt to characterize such persons. If Mr. McAllister is a true prophet, if we are to lose some of our "best people" by the imposition of an income tax, let them depart, and as they leave without regret the land of their birth, let them go with the poet's curse ringing in their ears:—

"Breathes there the man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my NATIVE LAND!
Whose heart hath ne'er within him burned,
As home his footsteps he hath turned
From wandering on a foreign strand?
If such there breathe, go, mark him well;
For him no minstrel raptures swell;
High though his titles, proud his name,
Boundless his wealth as wish can claim;
Despite those titles, power, and pelf,
The wretch, concentered all in self,
Living, shall forfeit fair renown,
And, doubly dying, shall go down
To the vile dust, from whence he sprung.
Unwept, unhonored, and unsung."

[Loud and long-continued applause.]

EDMUND BURKE

CONCILIATION WITH AMERICA

[Edmund Burke, a British statesman of distinguished oratorical powers, was born in Dublin in 1729, his mother being a Roman Catholic while his father was a Protestant, Burke himself adhering to his father's religion. He was sent to Trinity College, Dublin, and first attracted general attention by a "Vindication of Natural Society," intended to parody the literary methods of Bolingbroke. Next appeared the essay on the "Sublime and Beautiful," and, under distinguished auspices he entered parliament, where he astonished his hearers with a style of eloquence never heard there before. Burke's tall stature, his dignity, and his loud voice, the effect of which was heightened by an Irish accent, added to the novelty of his style. During the thirty years of his public life he made speeches in the House of Commons which have never been surpassed in impressiveness. He spoke in favor of the abolition of the slave-trade, resisted the exploitation of India by fortune-seekers, urged conciliation with America, and denounced despotism on one hand and lawlessness on the other. One of his most famous speeches opened the trial of Warren Hastings, and a second, equally famous, closed it. He published, likewise, various treatises, including "Causes of the Present Discontents," and "Reflections on the French Revolution." Burke retired with a liberal pension after having held important offices, and died in 1797. The following address, the most frequently quoted of any of his orations, was delivered in parliament in 1775, just before news reached England of the outbreak of the War of the Revolution.]

MR. SPEAKER: I hope, sir, that, notwithstanding the austerity of the chair, your good-nature will incline you to some degree of indulgence toward human frailty. You will not think it unnatural that those who have an object depending, which strongly engages their hopes and fears, should be somewhat inclined to superstition. As I came into the house full of anxiety about the event of my motion, I found, to my infinite surprise, that the grand penal bill, by which we had passed sentence on the trade

and sustenance of America, is to be returned to us from the other house. I do confess I could not help looking on this event as a fortunate omen. I look upon it as a sort of providential favor, by which we are put once more in possession of our deliberative capacity, upon a business so very questionable in its nature, so very uncertain in its issue. By the return of this bill, which seemed to have taken its flight forever, we are, at this very instant, nearly as free to choose a plan for our American government, as we were on the first day of the session. If, sir, we incline to the side of conciliation, we are not at all embarrassed (unless we please to make ourselves so) by any incongruous mixture of coercion and restraint. We are therefore called upon, as it were, by a superior warning voice, again to attend to America; to attend to the whole of it together; and to review the subject with an unusual degree of care and calmness.

Surely it is an awful subject, or there is none so on this side of the grave. When I first had the honor of a seat in this house, the affairs of that continent pressed themselves upon us as the most important and most delicate object of parliamentary attention. My little share in this great deliberation oppressed me. I found myself a partaker in a very high trust; and having no sort of reason to rely on the strength of my natural abilities for the proper execution of that trust, I was obliged to take more than common pains to instruct myself in everything which relates to our colonies. I was not less under the necessity of forming some fixed ideas concerning the general policy of the British Empire. Something of this sort seemed to be indispensable, in order, amid so vast a fluctuation of passions and opinions, to concenter my thoughts; to ballast my conduct; to preserve me from being blown about by every wind of fashionable doctrine. I really did not think it safe or manly to have fresh principles to seek upon every fresh mail which should arrive from America.

At that period I had the fortune to find myself in perfect concurrence with a large majority in this house. Bowing under that high authority, and penetrated with the sharpness and strength of that early impression, I have continued ever since in my original sentiments without the

least deviation. Whether this be owing to an obstinate perseverance in error, or to a religious adherence to what appears to me truth and reason, it is in your equity to judge.

Sir, parliament having an enlarged view of objects, made, during this interval, more frequent changes in their sentiment and their conduct than could be justified in a particular person upon the contracted scale of private information. But though I do not hazard anything approaching to a censure on the motives of former parliaments to all those alterations, one fact is undoubted—that under them the state of America has been kept in continual agitation. Everything administered as remedy to the public complaint, if it did not produce, was at least followed by, a heightening of the distemper; until, by a variety of experiments, that important country has been brought into her present situation—a situation which I will not miscall, which I dare not name, which I scarcely know how to comprehend in the terms of any description.

In this posture, sir, things stood at the beginning of the session. About that time, a worthy member of great parliamentary experience, who, in the year 1766, filled the chair of the American committee with much ability, took me aside, and, lamenting the present aspect of our politics, told me things were come to such a pass that our former methods of proceeding in the house would be no longer tolerated. That the public tribunal (never too indulgent to a long and unsuccessful opposition) would now scrutinize our conduct with unusual severity. That the very vicissitudes and shiftings of ministerial measures, instead of convicting their authors of inconstancy and want of system, would be taken as an occasion of charging us with a predetermined discontent, which nothing could satisfy; while we accused every measure of vigor as cruel, and every proposal of lenity as weak and irresolute. The public, he said, would not have patience to see us play the game out with our adversaries: we must produce our hand. It would be expected that those who, for many years, had been active in such affairs, should show that they had formed some clear and decided idea of the principles of colonial government, and were capable of drawing out something like a

platform of the ground which might be laid for future and permanent tranquillity.

I felt the truth of what my honorable friend represented, but I felt my situation too. His application might have been made with far greater propriety to many other gentlemen. No man was, indeed, ever better disposed or worse qualified for such an undertaking than myself. Though I gave so far into his opinion that I immediately threw my thoughts into a sort of parliamentary form, I was by no means equally ready to produce them. It generally argues some degree of natural impotence of mind, or some want of knowledge of the world, to hazard plans of government, except from a seat of authority. Propositions are made, not only ineffectually, but somewhat disreputably, when the minds of men are not properly disposed for their reception; and, for my part, I am not ambitious of ridicule—not absolutely a candidate for disgrace.

Besides, sir, to speak the plain truth, I have in general no very exalted opinion of the virtue of paper government, nor of any politics in which the plan is to be wholly separated from the execution. But when I saw that anger and violence prevailed every day more and more, and that things were hastening toward an incurable alienation of our colonies, I confess my caution gave way. I felt this as one of those few moments in which decorum yields to a higher duty. Public calamity is a mighty leveler, and there are occasions when any, even the slightest, chance of doing good must be laid hold on, even by the most inconsiderable person.

To restore order and repose to an empire so great and so distracted as ours, is merely in the attempt an undertaking that would ennoble the flights of the highest genius, and obtain pardon for the efforts of the meanest understanding. Struggling a good while with these thoughts, by degrees I felt myself more firm. I derived, at length, some confidence from what in other circumstances usually produces timidity. I grew less anxious, even from the idea of my own insignificance. For, judging of what you are by what you ought to be, I persuaded myself that you would not reject a reasonable proposition because it had nothing but its reason to recommend it. On the other hand, being totally

destitute of all shadow of influence, natural or adventitious, I was very sure that if my proposition were futile or dangerous—if it were weakly conceived or improperly timed, there was nothing exterior to it of power to awe, dazzle, or delude you. You will see it just as it is, and you will treat it just as it deserves.

The proposition is peace. Not peace through the medium of war; not peace to be hunted through the labyrinth of intricate and endless negotiations; not peace to arise out of universal discord, fomented from principle, in all parts of the empire; not peace to depend on the juridical determination of perplexing questions, or the precise marking the shadowy boundaries of a complex government. It is simple peace, sought in its natural course and its ordinary haunts. It is peace sought in the spirit of peace, and laid in principles purely pacific. I propose, by removing the ground of the difference, and by restoring *the former unsuspecting confidence of the colonies in the mother country*, to give permanent satisfaction to your people; and, far from a scheme of ruling by discord, to reconcile them to each other in the same act, and by the bond of the very same interest, which reconciles them to British government.

My idea is nothing more. Refined policy ever has been the parent of confusion, and ever will be so as long as the world endures. Plain good intention, which is as easily discovered at the first view as fraud is surely detected at last, is (let me say) of no mean force in the government of mankind. Genuine simplicity of heart is a healing and cementing principle. My plan, therefore, being formed upon the most simple grounds imaginable, may disappoint some people when they hear it. It has nothing to recommend it to the pruriency of curious ears. There is nothing at all new and captivating in it. It has nothing of the splendor of the project which has been lately laid upon your table by the noble lord in the blue ribbon. It does not propose to fill your lobby with squabbling colony agents, who will require the interposition of your mace at every instant to keep the peace among them. It does not institute a magnificent auction of finance, where captivated provinces come to general ransom by bidding against each other, until you knock down the hammer, and determine a proportion of

payments beyond all the powers of algebra to equalize and settle.

The plan which I shall presume to suggest derives, however, one great advantage from the proposition and registry of that noble lord's project. The idea of conciliation is admissible. First, the house, in accepting the resolution moved by the noble lord, has admitted, notwithstanding the menacing front of our address, notwithstanding our heavy bill of pains and penalties, that we do not think ourselves precluded from all ideas of free grace and bounty.

The house has gone further: it has declared conciliation admissible, *previous* to any submission on the part of America. It has even shot a good deal beyond that mark, and has admitted that the complaints of our former mode of exerting the right of taxation were not wholly unfounded. That right, thus exerted, is allowed to have had something reprehensible in it, something unwise, or something grievous; since, in the midst of our heat and resentment, we, of ourselves, have proposed a capital alteration, and, in order to get rid of what seemed so very exceptionable, have instituted a mode that is altogether new; one that is, indeed, wholly alien from all the ancient methods and forms of parliament.

The *principle* of this proceeding is large enough for my purpose. The means proposed by the noble lord for carrying his ideas into execution, I think, indeed, are very indifferently suited to the end; and this I shall endeavor to show you before I sit down. But, for the present, I take my ground on the admitted principle. I mean to give peace. Peace implies reconciliation; and, where there has been a material dispute, reconciliation does in a manner always imply concession on the one part or on the other. In this state of things I make no difficulty in affirming that the proposal ought to originate from us. Great and acknowledged force is not impaired, either in effect or in opinion, by an unwillingness to exert itself. The superior power may offer peace with honor and with safety. Such an offer from such a power will be attributed to magnanimity. But the concessions of the weak are the concessions of fear. When such a one is disarmed, he is wholly at the mercy of his superior, and he loses forever that time and

those chances which, as they happen to all men, are the strength and resources of all inferior power.

The capital leading questions on which you must this day decide, are these two: *First, whether you ought to concede; and, secondly, what your concession ought to be.*

On the first of these questions we have gained, as I have just taken the liberty of observing to you, some ground. But I am sensible that a good deal more is still to be done. Indeed, sir, to enable us to determine both on the one and the other of these great questions with a firm and precise judgment, I think it may be necessary to consider distinctly: The true *nature* and the peculiar *circumstances* of the object which we have before us; because, after all our struggle, whether we will or not, we must govern America according to that nature and to those circumstances, and not according to our imaginations; not according to abstract ideas of right; by no means according to mere general theories of government, the resort to which appears to me, in our present situation, no better than arrant trifling. I shall therefore endeavor, with your leave, to lay before you some of the most material of these circumstances in as full and as clear a manner as I am able to state them.

(1) The first thing that we have to consider with regard to the nature of the object is the number of people in the colonies. I have taken for some years a good deal of pains on that point. I can by no calculation justify myself in placing the number below two millions of inhabitants of our own European blood and color, besides at least five hundred thousand others, who form no inconsiderable part of the strength and opulence of the whole. This, sir, is, I believe, about the true number. There is no occasion to exaggerate, where plain truth is of so much weight and importance. But whether I put the present numbers too high or too low is a matter of little moment. Such is the strength with which population shoots in that part of the world, that, state the numbers as high as we will, while the dispute continues, the exaggeration ends. While we are discussing any given magnitude, they are grown to it. While we spend our time in deliberating on the mode of governing two millions, we shall find we have two millions more to manage. Your children do not grow faster from infancy to

manhood than they spread from families to communities, and from villages to nations.

I put this consideration of the present and the growing numbers in the front of our deliberation; because, sir, this consideration will make it evident to a blunter discernment than yours that no partial, narrow, contracted, pinched, occasional system will be at all suitable to such an object. It will show you that it is not to be considered as one of those minima which are out of the eye and consideration of the law; not a paltry excrescence of the state; not a mean dependent, who may be neglected with little damage, and provoked with little danger. It will prove that some degree of care and caution is required in the handling such an object; it will show that you ought not, in reason, to trifle with so large a mass of the interests and feelings of the human race. You could at no time do so without guilt; and, be assured, you will not be able to do it long with impunity.

But the population of this country, the great and growing population, though a very important consideration, will lose much of its weight, if not combined with other circumstances. The commerce of your colonies is out of all proportion beyond the numbers of the people. This ground of their commerce, indeed, has been trod some days ago, and with great ability, by a distinguished person at your bar. This gentleman, after thirty-five years—it is so long since he appeared at the same place to plead for the commerce of Great Britain—has come again before you to plead the same cause, without any other effect of time than that, to the fire of imagination and extent of erudition which even then marked him as one of the first literary characters of his age, he has added a consummate knowledge in the commercial interest of his country, formed by a long course of enlightened and discriminating experience.

(2) Sir, I should be inexcusable in coming after such a person with any detail, if a great part of the members who now fill the house had not the misfortune to be absent when he appeared at your bar. Besides, sir, I propose to take the matter at periods of time somewhat different from his. There is, if I mistake not, a point of view from whence, if you will look at this subject, it is impossible that it should not make an impression upon you.

I have in my hand two accounts: one a comparative state of the export trade of England to its colonies as it stood in the year 1704, and as it stood in the year 1772; the other a state of the export trade of this country to its colonies alone, as it stood in 1772, compared with the whole trade of England to all parts of the world, the colonies included, in the year 1704. They are from good vouchers; the latter period from the accounts on your table, the earlier from an original manuscript of Davenant, who first established the inspector-general's office, which has been, ever since his time, so abundant a source of parliamentary information.

The export trade to the colonies consists of three great branches: the African, which, terminating almost wholly in the colonies, must be put to the account of their commerce; the West Indian, and the North American. All these are so interwoven, that the attempt to separate them would tear to pieces the contexture of the whole, and, if not entirely destroy, would very much depreciate the value of all the parts. I therefore consider these three denominations to be, what in effect they are, one trade.

The trade to the colonies, taken on the export side, at the beginning of this century, that is, in the year 1704, stood thus:—

Exports to North America and the West Indies .	£483,265
To Africa	86,665
	£569,930

In the year 1772, which I take as a middle year between the highest and lowest of those lately laid on your table, the account was as follows:—

To North America and the West Indies .	£4,791,734
To Africa	866,398
To which, if you add the export trade from Scotland, which had in 1704 no existence	364,000
	£6,022,132

From five hundred and odd thousand, it has grown to six millions. It has increased no less than twelvefold. This is the state of the colony trade, as compared with

itself at these two periods within the century; and this is matter for meditation. But this is not all. Examine my second account. See how the export trade to the colonies alone in 1772 stood in the other point of view, that is, as compared to the whole trade of England in 1704:—

The whole export trade of England, including that to the colonies, in 1704	£6,509,000
Exported to the colonies alone, in 1772 . .	6,024,000
Difference	£485,000

The trade with America alone is now within less than £500,000 of being equal to what this great commercial nation, England, carried on at the beginning of this century with the whole world! If I had taken the largest year of those on your table, it would rather have exceeded. But, it will be said, is not this American trade an unnatural protuberance, that has drawn the juices from the rest of the body? The reverse. It is the very food that has nourished every other part into its present magnitude. Our general trade has been greatly augmented, and augmented more or less in almost every part to which it ever extended, but with this material difference: that of the six millions which in the beginning of the century constituted the whole mass of our export commerce, the colony trade was but one twelfth part; it is now (as a part of sixteen millions) considerably more than a third of the whole. This is the relative proportion of the importance of the colonies of these two periods; and all reasoning concerning our mode of treating them must have this proportion as its basis, or it is a reasoning weak, rotten, and sophistical.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot prevail on myself to hurry over this great consideration. It is good for us to be here. We stand where we have an immense view of what is, and what is past. Clouds, indeed, and darkness, rest upon the future. Let us, however, before we descend from this noble eminence, reflect that this growth of our national prosperity has happened within the short period of the life of man. It has happened within sixty-eight years. There are those alive whose memory might touch the two extremities. For instance, my Lord Bathurst might remember all the stages

of the progress. He was in 1704 of an age at least to be made to comprehend such things. He was then old enough

"Acta parentum
Jam legere et quæ sit poterit cognoscere virtus."

Suppose, sir, that the angel of this auspicious youth, foreseeing the many virtues which made him one of the most amiable, as he is one of the most fortunate men of his age, had opened to him in vision, that when, in the fourth generation, the third prince of the house of Brunswick had sat twelve years on the throne of that nation, which, by the happy issue of moderate and healing counsels, was to be made Great Britain, he should see his son, Lord Chancellor of England, turn back the current of hereditary dignity to its fountain, and raise him to a higher rank of peerage, while he enriched the family with a new one. If, amid these bright and happy scenes of domestic honor and prosperity, that angel should have drawn up the curtain, and unfolded the rising glories of his country, and while he was gazing with admiration on the then commercial grandeur of England, the genius should point out to him a little speck, scarce visible in the mass of the national interest, a small seminal principle rather than a formed body, and should tell him: "Young man, there is America—which at this day serves for little more than to amuse you with stories of savage men and uncouth manners; yet shall, before you taste death, show itself equal to the whole of that commerce which now attracts the envy of the world. Whatever England has been growing to by a progressive increase of improvement, brought in by varieties of people, by succession of civilizing conquests and civilizing settlements, in a series of seventeen hundred years, you shall see as much added to her by America in the course of a single life!" If this state of his country had been foretold to him, would it not require all the sanguine credulity of youth, and all the fervid glow of enthusiasm, to make him believe it? Fortunate man, he has lived to see it! Fortunate indeed, if he lived to see nothing to vary the prospect and cloud the setting of his day!

Excuse me, sir, if, turning from such thoughts, I resume this comparative view once more. You have seen it on a

large scale; look at it on a small one. I will point out to your attention a particular instance of it in the single province of Pennsylvania. In the year 1704 that province called for £11,459 in value of your commodities, native and foreign. This was the whole. What did it demand in 1772? Why nearly fifty times as much; for in that year the export to Pennsylvania was £507,909, nearly equal to the export to all the colonies together in the first period.

I choose, sir, to enter into these minute and particular details, because generalities, which, in all other cases are apt to heighten and raise the subject, have here a tendency to sink it. When we speak of the commerce with our colonies, fiction lags after truth, invention is unfruitful, and imagination cold and barren.

So far, sir, as to the importance of the object in the view of its commerce, as concerned in the exports from England. If I were to detail the imports, I could show how many enjoyments they procure, which deceive the burden of life; how many materials which invigorate the springs of national industry, and extend and animate every part of our foreign and domestic commerce. This would be a curious subject indeed; but I must prescribe bounds to myself in a matter so vast and various.

(3) I pass, therefore, to the colonies in another point of view—their agriculture. This they have prosecuted with such a spirit, that, besides feeding plentifully their own growing multitude, their annual export of grain, comprehending rice, has, some years ago, exceeded a million in value. Of their last harvest I am persuaded they will export much more. At the beginning of the century some of these colonies imported corn from the mother country. For some time past the old world has been fed from the new. The scarcity which you have felt would have been a desolating famine, if this child of your old age, with a true filial piety, with a Roman charity, had not put the full breast of its youthful exuberance to the mouth of its exhausted parent.

As to the wealth which the colonies have drawn from the sea by their fisheries, you had all that matter fully opened at your bar. You surely thought those acquisitions of value, for they seemed even to excite your envy; and

yet the spirit by which that enterprising employment has been exercised ought rather, in my opinion, to have raised your esteem and admiration. And pray, sir, what in the world is equal to it? Pass by the other parts and look at the manner in which the people of New England have of late carried on the whale-fishery. While we follow them among the tumbling mountains of ice, and behold them penetrating into the deepest frozen recesses of Hudson Bay and Davis Straits — while we are looking for them beneath the arctic circle, we hear that they have pierced into the opposite region of polar cold—that they are at the antipodes, and engaged under the frozen serpent of the south. Falkland Islands, which seemed too remote and romantic an object for the grasp of national ambition, is but a stage and resting-place in the progress of their victorious industry. Nor is the equinoctial heat more discouraging to them than the accumulated winter of both poles. We know that while some of them draw the line and strike the harpoon on the coast of Africa, others run the longitude, and pursue their gigantic game along the coast of Brazil. No sea but what is vexed by their fisheries. No climate that is not witness to their toils. Neither the perseverance of Holland, nor the activity of France, nor the dexterous and firm sagacity of English enterprise, ever carried this most perilous mode of hardy industry to the extent to which it has been pushed by this recent people—a people who are still, as it were, but in the gristle, and not yet hardened into the bone of manhood. When I contemplate these things—when I know that the colonies in general owe little or nothing to any care of ours, and that they are not squeezed into this happy form by the constraints of a watchful and suspicious government, but that, through a wise and salutary neglect, a generous nature has been suffered to take her own way to perfection—when I reflect upon these effects—when I see how profitable they have been to us, I feel all the pride of power sink, and all presumption in the wisdom of human contrivances melt and die away within me. My rigor relents. I pardon something to the spirit of liberty.

I am sensible, sir, that all which I have asserted in my detail is admitted in the gross; but that quite a different

conclusion is drawn from it. America, gentlemen say, is a noble object. It is an object well worth fighting for. Certainly it is, if fighting a people be the best way of gaining them. Gentlemen in this respect will be led to their choice of means by their complexions and their habits. Those who understand the military art will, of course, have some predilection for it. Those who wield the thunder of the state may have more confidence in the efficacy of arms. But I confess, possibly for want of this knowledge, my opinion is much more in favor of prudent management than of force; considering force not as an odious, but a feeble instrument for preserving a people so numerous, so active, so growing, so spirited as this, in a profitable and subordinate connection with us.

First, sir, permit me to observe, that the use of force alone is but temporary. It may subdue for a moment, but it does not remove the necessity of subduing again; and a nation is not governed which is perpetually to be conquered.

My next objection is its uncertainty. Terror is not always the effect of force; and an armament is not a victory. If you do not succeed, you are without resource; for, conciliation failing, force remains; but, force failing, no further hope of reconciliation is left. Power and authority are sometimes bought by kindness, but they can never be begged as alms by an impoverished and defeated violence.

A further objection to force is that you impair the object by your very endeavors to preserve it. The thing you fought for is not the thing which you recover; but depreciated, sunk, wasted, and consumed in the contest. Nothing less will content me than *whole* America. I do not choose to consume its strength along with our own, because in all parts it is the British strength that I consume. I do not choose to be caught by a foreign enemy at the end of this exhausting conflict, and still less in the midst of it. I may escape; but I can make no insurance against such an event. Let me add, that I do not choose wholly to break the American spirit, because it is the spirit that has made the country.

Lastly, we have no sort of experience in favor of force as an instrument in the rule of our colonies. Their growth and their utility have been owing to methods altogether

different. Our ancient indulgence has been said to be pursued to a fault. It may be so; but we know, if feeling is evidence, that our fault was more tolerable than our attempt to mend it; and our sin far more salutary than our penitence.

These, sir, are my reasons for not entertaining that high opinion of untried force, by which many gentlemen, for whose sentiments in other particulars I have great respect, seem to be so greatly captivated.

But there is still behind a third consideration concerning this object, which serves to determine my opinion on the sort of policy which ought to be pursued in the management of America, even more than its population and its commerce—I mean its temper and character. In this character of the Americans a love of freedom is the predominating feature which marks and distinguishes the whole; and, as an ardent is always a jealous affection, your colonies become suspicious, restive, and untractable, whenever they see the least attempt to wrest from them by force, or shuffle from them by chicane, what they think the only advantage worth living for. This fierce spirit of liberty is stronger in the English colonies, probably, than in any other people of the earth, and this from a variety of powerful causes, which, to understand the true temper of their minds, and the direction which this spirit takes, it will not be amiss to lay open somewhat more largely.

First, the people of the colonies are descendants of Englishmen. England, sir, is a nation which still, I hope, respects, and formerly adored, her freedom. The colonists emigrated from you when this part of your character was most predominant; and they took this bias and direction the moment they parted from your hands. They are, therefore, not only devoted to liberty, but to liberty according to English ideas and on English principles. Abstract liberty, like other mere abstractions, is not to be found. Liberty inheres in some sensible object; and every nation has formed to itself some favorite point which, by way of eminence, becomes the criterion of their happiness. It happened, you know, sir, that the great contests for freedom in this country were, from the earliest times, chiefly upon the question of taxing. Most of the contests in the ancient

commonwealths turned primarily on the right of election of magistrates, or on the balance among the several orders of the state. The question of money was not with them so immediate. But in England it was otherwise. On this point of taxes the ablest pens and most eloquent tongues have been exercised; the greatest spirits have acted and suffered. In order to give the fullest satisfaction concerning the importance of this point, it was not only necessary for those who in argument defended the excellence of the English Constitution, to insist on this privilege of granting money as a dry point of fact, and to prove that the right had been acknowledged in ancient parchments and blind usages to reside in a certain body called the House of Commons. They went much further: they attempted to prove (and they succeeded) that in theory it ought to be so, from the particular nature of a House of Commons, as an immediate representative of the people, whether the old records had delivered this oracle or not. They took infinite pains to inculcate, as a fundamental principle, that in all monarchies the people must, in effect, themselves, mediately or immediately, possess the power of granting their own money, or no shadow of liberty could subsist. The colonies draw from you, as with their life-blood, those ideas and principles, their love of liberty, as with you, fixed and attached on this specific point of taxing. Liberty might be safe or might be endangered in twenty other particulars, without their being much pleased or alarmed. Here they felt its pulse; and, as they found that beat, they thought themselves sick or sound. I do not say whether they were right or wrong in applying your general arguments to their own case. It is not easy, indeed, to make a monopoly of theorems and corollaries. The fact is, that they did thus apply those general arguments; and your mode of governing them, whether through lenity or indolence, through wisdom or mistake, confirmed them in the imagination that they, as well as you, had an interest in these common principles.

They were further confirmed in these pleasing errors by the form of their provincial legislative assemblies. Their governments are popular in a high degree; some are merely popular; in all, the popular representative is the most

weighty; and this share of the people in their ordinary government never fails to inspire them with lofty sentiments, and with a strong aversion from whatever tends to deprive them of their chief importance.

If anything were wanting to this necessary operation of the form of government, religion would have given it a complete effect. Religion, always a principle of energy, in this new people is no way worn out or impaired; and their mode of professing it is also one main cause of this free spirit. The people are Protestants; and of that kind which is the most averse to all implicit submission of mind and opinion. This is a persuasion not only favorable to liberty, but built upon it. I do not think, sir, that the reason of this averseness in the dissenting churches from all that looks like absolute government, is so much to be sought in their religious tenets as in their history. Every one knows that the Roman Catholic Religion is at least coeval with most of the governments where it prevails; that it has generally gone hand in hand with them, and received great favor and every kind of support from authority. The Church of England, too, was formed from her cradle under the nursing care of regular government. But the dissenting interests have sprung up in direct opposition to all the ordinary powers of the world, and could justify that opposition only on a strong claim to natural liberty. Their very existence depended on the powerful and unremitted assertion of that claim. All protestantism, even the most cold and passive, is a kind of dissent. But the religion most prevalent in our northern colonies is a refinement on the principle of resistance; it is the dissidence of dissent and the protestantism of the Protestant Religion. This religion, under a variety of denominations, agreeing in nothing but in the communion of the spirit of liberty, is predominant in most of the northern provinces; where the Church of England, notwithstanding its legal rights, is in reality no more than a sort of private sect, not composing, most probably, the tenth of the people. The colonists left England when this spirit was high, and in the emigrants was the highest of all; and even that stream of foreigners, which has been constantly flowing into these colonies, has, for the greatest part, been composed of dissenters from the establishments

of their several countries, who have brought with them a temper and character far from alien to that of the people with whom they mixed.

Sir, I can perceive by their manner that some gentlemen object to the latitude of this description, because in the southern colonies the Church of England forms a large body, and has a regular establishment. It is certainly true. There is, however, a circumstance attending these colonies which, in my opinion, fully counterbalances this difference, and makes the spirit of liberty still more high and haughty than in those to the northward. It is that in Virginia and the Carolinas they have a vast multitude of *slaves*. Where this is the case in any part of the world, those who are free are by far the most proud and jealous of their freedom. Freedom is to them not only an enjoyment, but a kind of rank and privilege. Not seeing there that freedom, as in countries where it is a common blessing, and as broad and general as the air, may be united with much abject toil, with great misery, with all the exterior of servitude, liberty looks, among them, like something that is more noble and liberal. I do not mean, sir, to commend the superior morality of this sentiment, which has at least as much pride as virtue in it; but I cannot alter the nature of man. The fact is so; and these people of the southern colonies are much more strongly, and with a higher and more stubborn spirit, attached to liberty than those to the northward. Such were all the ancient commonwealths; such were our Gothic ancestors; such, in our days, were the Poles, and such will be all masters of slaves, who are not slaves themselves. In such a people the haughtiness of domination combines with the spirit of freedom, fortifies it, and renders it invincible.

Permit me, sir, to add another circumstance in our colonies, which contributes no mean part toward the growth and effect of this untractable spirit—I mean their education. In no other country, perhaps, in the world is the law so general a study. The profession itself is numerous and powerful, and in most provinces it takes the lead. The greater number of the deputies sent to Congress were lawyers. But all who read, and most do read, endeavor to obtain some smattering in that science. I have been told

by an eminent bookseller that in no branch of his business, after tracts of popular devotion, were so many books as those on the law exported to the plantations. The colonists have now fallen into the way of printing them for their own use. I hear that they have sold nearly as many of "Blackstone's Commentaries" in America as in England. General Gage marks out this disposition very particularly in a letter on your table. He states that all the people in his government are lawyers, or smatterers in law; and that in Boston they have been enabled, by successful chicane, wholly to evade many parts of one of your capital penal constitutions. The smartness of debate will say that this knowledge ought to teach them more clearly the rights of legislature, their obligations to obedience, and the penalties of rebellion. All this is mighty well. But my honorable and learned friend [the Attorney-General, afterward Lord Thurlow] on the floor, who condescends to mark what I say for animadversion, will disdain that ground. He has heard, as well as I, that when great honors and great emoluments do not win over this knowledge to the service of the state, it is a formidable adversary to government. If the spirit be not tamed and broken by these happy methods, it is stubborn and litigious. Abeunt studia in mores. This study renders men acute, inquisitive, dexterous, prompt in attack, ready in defense, full of resources. In other countries, the people, more simple and of a less mercurial cast, judge of an ill principle in government only by an actual grievance. Here they anticipate the evil, and judge of the pressure of the grievance by the badness of the principle. They augur misgovernment at a distance, and snuff the approach of tyranny in every tainted breeze.

The last cause of this disobedient spirit in the colonies is hardly less powerful than the rest, as it is not merely moral, but laid deep in the natural constitution of things. Three thousand miles of ocean lie between you and them. No contrivance can prevent the effect of this distance in weakening government. Seas roll and months pass between the order and the execution; and the want of a speedy explanation of a single point is enough to defeat the whole system. You have, indeed, "winged ministers" of vengeance, who carry your bolts in their pouches to the re-

motest verge of the sea. But there a power steps in that limits the arrogance of raging passion and furious elements, and says: "So far shalt thou go, and no farther." Who are you, that should fret and rage and bite the chains of nature? Nothing worse happens to you than does to all nations who have extensive empire; and it happens in all the forms into which empire can be thrown. In large bodies the circulation of power must be less vigorous at the extremities. Nature has said it. The Turk cannot govern Egypt, and Arabia, and Koordistan as he governs Thrace; nor has he the same dominion in Crimea and Algiers which he has at Brusa and Smyrna. Despotism itself is obliged to truck and huckster. The sultan gets such obedience as he can. He governs with a loose rein, that he may govern at all; and the whole of the force and vigor of his authority in his center is derived from a prudent relaxation in all his borders. Spain, in her provinces, is, perhaps, not so well obeyed as you are in yours. She complies too; she submits; she watches times. This is the immutable condition, the eternal law, of extensive and detached empire.

Then, sir, from these six capital sources of descent, of form of government, of religion in the northern provinces, of manners in the southern, of education, of the remoteness of situation from the first mover of government—from all these causes a fierce spirit of liberty has grown up. It has grown with the growth of the people in your colonies, and increased with the increase of their wealth; a spirit that, unhappily meeting with an exercise of power in England, which, however lawful, is not reconcilable to any ideas of liberty, much less with theirs, has kindled this flame, that is ready to consume us.

I do not mean to commend either the spirit in this excess, or the moral causes which produce it. Perhaps a more smooth and accommodating spirit of freedom in them would be more acceptable to us. Perhaps ideas of liberty might be desired, more reconcilable with an arbitrary and boundless authority. Perhaps we might wish the colonists to be persuaded that their liberty is more secure when held in trust for them by us, as guardians during a perpetual minority, than with any part of it in their own hands. But the question is not whether their spirit deserves praise or

blame. What, in the name of God, shall we do with it? You have before you the object, such as it is, with all its glories, with all its imperfections on its head. You see the magnitude, the importance, the temper, the habits, the disorders. By all these considerations we are strongly urged to determine something concerning it. We are called upon to fix some rule and line for our future conduct which may give a little stability to our politics, and prevent the return of such unhappy deliberations as the present. Every such return will bring the matter before us in a still more untractable form. For, what astonishing and incredible things have we not seen already? What monsters have not been generated from this unnatural contention? While every principle of authority and resistance has been pushed upon both sides, as far as it would go, there is nothing so solid and certain, either in reasoning or in practise, that it has not been shaken. Until very lately, all authority in America seemed to be nothing but an emanation from yours. Even the popular part of the colony constitution derived all its activity, and its first vital movement, from the pleasure of the crown. We thought, sir, that the utmost which the discontented colonists could do was to disturb authority. We never dreamed they could of themselves supply it, knowing in general what an operose business it is to establish a government absolutely new. But having, for our purposes in this contention, resolved that none but an obedient assembly should sit, the humors of the people there, finding all passage through the legal channel stopped, with great violence broke out another way. Some provinces have tried their experiment as we have tried ours; and theirs has succeeded. They have formed a government sufficient for its purposes, without the bustle of a revolution, or the troublesome formality of an election. Evident necessity and tacit consent have done the business in an instant. So well they have done it, that Lord Dunmore (the account is among the fragments on your table) tells you, that the new institution is infinitely better obeyed than the ancient government ever was in its most fortunate periods. Obedience is what makes government, and not the names by which it is called; nor the name of governor, as formerly, or committee, as at present. This new government has originated

directly from the people, and was not transmitted through any of the ordinary artificial media of a positive constitution. It was not a manufacture ready formed, and transmitted to them in that condition from England. The evil arising from hence is this: that the colonists having once found the possibility of enjoying the advantages of order in the midst of a struggle for liberty, such struggles will not henceforward seem so terrible to the settled and sober part of mankind as they had appeared before the trial.

Pursuing the same plan of punishing by the denial of the exercise of government to still greater lengths, we wholly abrogated the ancient government of Massachusetts. We were confident that the first feeling, if not the very prospect of anarchy, would instantly enforce a complete submission. The experiment was tried. A new, strange, unexpected face of things appeared. Anarchy is found tolerable. A vast province has now subsisted, and subsisted in a considerable degree of health and vigor, for near a twelvemonth, without governor, without public council, without judges, without executive magistrates. How long it will continue in this state, or what may arise out of this unheard-of situation, how can the wisest of us conjecture? Our late experience has taught us, that many of those fundamental principles formerly believed infallible, are either not of the importance they were imagined to be, or that we have not at all adverted to some other far more important and far more powerful principles, which entirely overrule those we had considered as omnipotent. I am much against any further experiments which tend to put to the proof any more of these allowed opinions which contribute so much to the public tranquillity. In effect, we suffer as much at home by this loosening of all ties, and this concussion of all established opinions, as we do abroad. For, in order to prove that the Americans have no right to their liberties, we are every day endeavoring to subvert the maxims which preserve the whole spirit of our own. To prove that the Americans ought not to be free, we are obliged to depreciate the value of freedom itself; and we never seem to gain a paltry advantage over them in debate, without attacking some of those principles, or deriding some of those feelings, for which our ancestors have shed their blood.

But, sir, in wishing to put an end to pernicious experiments, I do not mean to preclude the fullest inquiry. Far from it. Far from deciding on a sudden or partial view, I would patiently go round and round the subject, and survey it minutely in every possible aspect. Sir, if I were capable of engaging you to an equal attention, I would state that, as far as I am capable of discerning, there are but three ways of proceeding relative to this stubborn spirit which prevails in your colonies and disturbs your government. These are, to change that spirit, as inconvenient, by removing the causes; to prosecute it as criminal; or to comply with it as necessary. I would not be guilty of an imperfect enumeration. I can think of but these three. Another has, indeed, been started—that of giving up the colonies; but it met so slight a reception, that I do not think myself obliged to dwell a great while upon it. It is nothing but a little sally of anger, like the frowardness of peevish children, who, when they cannot get all they would have, are resolved to take nothing.

The first of these plans, to change the spirit, as inconvenient, by removing the causes, I think is the most like a systematic proceeding. It is radical in its principle, but it is attended with great difficulties, some of them little short, as I conceive, of impossibilities. This will appear by examining into the plans which have been proposed.

As the growing population of the colonies is evidently one cause of their resistance, it was last session mentioned in both houses by men of weight, and received, not without applause, that, in order to check this evil, it would be proper for the crown to make no further grants of land. But to this scheme there are two objections. The first, that there is already so much unsettled land in private hands as to afford room for an immense future population, although the crown not only withheld its grants, but annihilated its soil. If this be the case, then the only effect of this avarice of desolation, this hoarding of a royal wilderness, would be to raise the value of the possessions in the hands of the great private monopolists, without any adequate check to the growing and alarming mischief of population.

But if you stopped your grants, what would be the con-

sequence? The people would occupy without grants. They have already so occupied in many places. You cannot station garrisons in every part of these deserts. If you drive the people from one place they will carry on their annual tillage, and remove with their flocks and herds to another. Many of the people in the back settlements are already little attached to particular situations. Already they have topped the Appalachian Mountains. From thence they behold before them an immense plain, one vast, rich, level meadow—a square of five hundred miles. Over this they would wander without a possibility of restraint. They would change their manners with the habits of their life; would soon forget a government by which they were disowned; would become hordes of English Tartars; and, pouring down upon your unfortified frontiers a fierce and irresistible cavalry, become masters of your governors and your counselors, your collectors and controllers, and of all the slaves that adhered to them. Such would, and, in no long time, must be the effect of attempting to forbid as a crime, and to suppress as an evil, the command and blessing of Providence, "Increase and multiply." Such would be the happy result of an endeavor to keep as a lair of wild beasts that earth which God by an express charter has given to the children of men. Far different, and surely much wiser, has been our policy hitherto. Hitherto we have invited our people, by every kind of bounty, to fixed establishments. We have invited the husbandman to look to authority for his title. We have taught him piously to believe in the mysterious virtue of wax and parchment. We have thrown each tract of land, as it was peopled, into districts, that the ruling power should never be wholly out of sight. We have settled all we could, and we have carefully attended every settlement with government.

Adhering, sir, as I do, to this policy, as well as for the reasons I have just given, I think this new project of hedging in population to be neither prudent nor practicable.

To impoverish the colonies in general, and in particular to arrest the noble course of their marine enterprises, would be a more easy task. I freely confess it. We have shown a disposition to a system of this kind; a disposition even to continue the restraint after the offense, looking on ourselves

as rivals to our colonies, and persuaded that of course we must gain all that they shall lose. Much mischief we may certainly do. The power inadequate to all other things is often more than sufficient for this. I do not look on the direct and immediate power of the colonies to resist our violence as very formidable. In this, however, I may be mistaken. But when I consider that we have colonies for no purpose but to be serviceable to us, it seems to my poor understanding a little preposterous to make them unserviceable in order to keep them obedient. It is, in truth, nothing more than the old and, as I thought, exploded problem of tyranny, which proposes to beggar its subjects into submission. But, remember, when you have completed your system of impoverishment, that Nature still proceeds in her ordinary course; that discontent will increase with misery; and that there are critical moments in the fortunes of all states, when they who are too weak to contribute to your prosperity may be strong enough to complete your ruin. "Spoliatis arma supersunt."

The temper and character which prevail in our colonies are, I am afraid, unalterable by any human art. We cannot, I fear, falsify the pedigree of this fierce people, and persuade them that they are not sprung from a nation in whose veins the blood of freedom circulates. The language in which they would hear you tell them this tale would detect the imposition. Your speech would betray you. An Englishman is the unfittest person on earth to argue another Englishman into slavery.

I think it is nearly as little in our power to change their republican religion as their free descent; or to substitute the Roman Catholic as a penalty, or the Church of England as an improvement. The mode of inquisition and dragooning is going out of fashion in the old world, and I should not confide much to their efficacy in the new. The education of the Americans is also on the same unalterable bottom with their religion. You cannot persuade them to burn their books of curious science; to banish their lawyers from their courts of law; or to quench the lights of their assemblies, by refusing to choose those persons who are best read in their privileges. It would be no less impracticable to think of wholly annihilating the popular assem-

blies in which these lawyers sit. The army, by which we must govern in their place, would be far more chargeable to us; not quite so effectual; and perhaps, in the end, full as difficult to be kept in obedience.

With regard to the high aristocratic spirit of Virginia and the southern colonies, it has been proposed, I know, to reduce it, by declaring a general enfranchisement of their slaves. This project has had its advocates and panegyrists, yet I never could argue myself into an opinion of it. Slaves are often much attached to their masters. A general wild offer of liberty would not always be accepted. History furnishes few instances of it. It is sometimes as hard to persuade slaves to be free as it is to compel freemen to be slaves; and in this auspicious scheme we should have both these pleasing tasks on our hands at once. But when we talk of enfranchisement, do we not perceive that the American master may enfranchise too, and arm servile hands in defense of freedom? A measure to which other people have had recourse more than once, and not without success, in a desperate situation of their affairs.

Slaves as these unfortunate black people are, and dull as all men are from slavery, must they not a little suspect the offer of freedom from that very nation which has sold them to their present masters? From that nation, one of whose causes of quarrel with those masters is their refusal to deal any more in that inhuman traffic? An offer of freedom from England would come rather oddly, shipped to them in an African vessel which is refused an entry into the ports of Virginia or Carolina, with a cargo of three hundred Angola negroes. It would be curious to see the Guinea captain attempt at the same instant to publish his proclamation of liberty and to advertise the sale of slaves.

But let us suppose all these moral difficulties got over. The ocean remains. You cannot pump this dry; and as long as it continues in its present bed, so long all the causes which weaken authority by distance will continue.

> "Ye gods! annihilate but space and time,
> And make two lovers happy!"

was a pious and passionate prayer, but just as reasonable

as many of these serious wishes of very grave and solemn politicians.

If, then, sir, it seems almost desperate to think of any alternative course for changing the moral causes (and not quite easy to remove the natural) which produce the prejudices irreconcilable to the late exercise of our authority, but that the spirit infallibly will continue, and, continuing, will produce such effects as now embarrass us, the second mode under consideration is to prosecute that spirit in its overt acts as *criminal.*

At this proposition I must pause for a moment. The thing seems a great deal too big for my ideas of jurisprudence. It should seem, to my way of conceiving such matters, that there is a very wide difference in reason and policy between the mode of proceeding on the irregular conduct of scattered individuals, or even of bands of men, who disturb order within the state, and the civil dissensions which may, from time to time, on great questions, agitate the several communities which compose a great empire. It looks to me to be narrow and pedantic to apply the ordinary ideas of criminal justice to this great public contest. I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people. I cannot insult and ridicule the feelings of millions of my fellow creatures, as Sir Edward Coke insulted one excellent individual at the bar. I am not ripe to pass sentence on the gravest public bodies, intrusted with magistracies of great authority and dignity, and charged with the safety of their fellow citizens, upon the very same title that I am. I really think that, for wise men, this is not judicious; for sober men, not decent; for minds tinctured with humanity, not mild and merciful.

Perhaps, sir, I am mistaken in my idea of an empire, as distinguished from a single state or kingdom. But my idea of it is this, that an empire is the aggregate of many states, under one common head, whether this head be a monarch or a presiding republic. It does, in such constitutions, frequently happen (and nothing but the dismal, cold, dead uniformity of servitude can prevent its happening) that the subordinate parts have many local privileges and immunities. Between these privileges and the supreme common authority, the line may be extremely nice. Of course, dis-

putes—often, too, very bitter disputes, and much ill blood, will arise. But though every privilege is an exemption, in the case, from the ordinary exercise of the supreme authority, it is no denial of it. The claim of a privilege seems rather, ex vi termini, to imply a superior power; for to talk of the privileges of a state or of a person who has no superior, is hardly any better than speaking nonsense. Now, in such unfortunate quarrels among the component parts of a great political union of communities, I can scarcely conceive anything more completely imprudent than for the head of the empire to insist that, if any privilege is pleaded against his will or his acts, his whole authority is denied; instantly to proclaim rebellion, to beat to arms, and to put the offending provinces under the ban. Will not this, sir, very soon teach the provinces to make no distinctions on their part? Will it not teach them that the government against which a claim of liberty is tantamount to high treason is a government to which submission is equivalent to slavery? It may not always be quite convenient to impress dependent communities with such an idea.

We are indeed, in all disputes with the colonies, by the necessity of things, the judge. It is true, sir; but I confess that the character of judge in my own cause is a thing that frightens me. Instead of filling me with pride, I am exceedingly humbled by it. I cannot proceed with a stern, assured, judicial confidence, until I find myself in something more like a judicial character. I must have these hesitations as long as I am compelled to recollect that, in my little reading upon such contests as these, the sense of mankind has at least as often decided against the superior as the subordinate power. Sir, let me add, too, that the opinion of my having some abstract right in my favor would not put me much at my ease in passing sentence, unless I could be sure that there were no rights which in their exercise under certain circumstances, were not the most odious of all wrongs, and the most vexatious of all injustice. Sir, these considerations have great weight with me, when I find things so circumstanced that I see the same party at once a civil litigant against me in point of right and a culprit before me; while I sit as criminal judge on acts of his whose moral quality is to be decided on upon the merits of that

very litigation. Men are every now and then put, by the complexity of human affairs, into strange situations; but justice is the same, let the judge be in what situation he will.

There is, sir, also a circumstance which convinces me that this mode of criminal proceeding is not, at least in the present stage of our contest, altogether expedient, which is nothing less than the conduct of those very persons who have seemed to adopt that mode, by lately declaring a rebellion in Massachusetts Bay, as they had formerly addressed to have traitors brought hither, under an act of Henry VIII., for trial. For, though rebellion is declared, it is not proceeded against as such; nor have any steps been taken toward the apprehension or conviction of any individual offender, either on our late or our former address; but modes of *public* coercion have been adopted, and such as have much more resemblance to a sort of qualified hostility toward an independent power than the punishment of rebellious subjects. All this seems rather inconsistent; but it shows how difficult it is to apply these juridical ideas to our present case.

In this situation, let us seriously and coolly ponder, what is it we have got by all our menaces, which have been many and ferocious. What advantage have we derived from the penal laws we have passed, and which, for the time, have been severe and numerous? What advances have we made toward our object by the sending of a force which, by land and sea, is no contemptible strength? Has the disorder abated? Nothing less. When I see things in this situation, after such confident hopes, bold promises, and active exertions, I cannot, for my life, avoid a suspicion that the plan itself is not correctly right.

If, then, the removal of the causes of this spirit of American liberty be, for the greater part, or rather entirely, impracticable; if the ideas of criminal process be inapplicable, or, if applicable, are in the highest degree inexpedient, what way yet remains? No way is open but the third and last—to comply with the American spirit as necessary, or, if you please, to submit to it as a necessary evil.

If we adopt this mode, if we mean to conciliate and concede, let us see of what nature the concessions ought to be.

To ascertain the nature of our concessions, we must look at their complaint. The colonies complain that they have not the characteristic mark and seal of British freedom. They complain that they are taxed in parliament in which they are not represented. If you mean to satisfy them at all, you must satisfy them with regard to this complaint. If you mean to please any people, you must give them the boon which they ask; not what you may think better for them, but of a kind totally different. Such an act may be a wise regulation, but it is no concession, whereas our present theme is the mode of giving satisfaction.

Sir, I think you must perceive that I am resolved this day to have nothing at all to do with the question of the right of taxation. Some gentlemen startle, but it is true. I put it totally out of the question. It is less than nothing in my consideration. I do not, indeed, wonder, nor will you, sir, that gentlemen of profound learning are fond of displaying it on this profound subject. But my consideration is narrow, confined, and wholly limited to the policy of the question. I do not examine whether the giving away a man's money be a power excepted and reserved out of the general trust of government, and how far all mankind, in all forms of polity, are entitled to an exercise of that right by the charter of nature; or whether, on the contrary, a right of taxation is necessarily involved in the general principle of legislation, and inseparable from the ordinary supreme power. These are deep questions, where great names militate against each other; where reason is perplexed; and an appeal to authorities only thickens the confusion; for high and reverend authorities lift up their heads on both sides, and there is no sure footing in the middle. The point is

> "That Serbonian bog
> 'Twixt Damietta and Mount Cassius old,
> Where armies whole have sunk."

I do not intend to be overwhelmed in this bog, though in such respectable company. The question with me is, not whether you have a right to render your people miserable, but whether it is not your interest to make them happy. It is not what the lawyer tells me I *may* do, but what

humanity, reason, and justice tell me I *ought* to do. Is a politic act the worse for being a generous one? Is no concession proper but that which is made from your want of right to keep what you grant? Or does it lessen the grace or dignity of relaxing in the exercise of an odious claim, because you have your evidence room full of titles, and your magazines stuffed with arms to enforce them? What signify all those titles and all those arms? Of what avail are they, when the reason of the thing tells me that the assertion of my title is the loss of my suit, and that I could do nothing but wound myself by the use of my own weapons?

Such is steadfastly my opinion of the absolute necessity of keeping up the concord of this empire by a unity of spirit, though in a diversity of operations, that, if I were sure the colonists had, at their leaving this country, sealed a regular compact of servitude; that they had solemnly abjured all the rights of citizens; that they had made a vow to renounce all ideas of liberty for them and their posterity to all generations, yet I should hold myself obliged to conform to the temper I found universally prevalent in my own day, and to govern two millions of men, impatient of servitude, on the principles of freedom. I am not determining a point of law. I am restoring tranquillity, and the general character and situation of a people must determine what sort of government is fitted for them. That point nothing else can or ought to determine.

My idea, therefore, without considering whether we yield as matter of right, or grant as matter of favor, is *to admit the people of our colonies into an interest in the Constitution*, and, by recording that admission in the journals of parliament, to give them as strong an assurance as the nature of the thing will admit, that we mean forever to adhere to that solemn declaration of systematic indulgence.

Some years ago, the repeal of a revenue act, upon its understood principle, might have served to show that we intended an unconditional abatement of the exercise of a taxing power. Such a measure was then sufficient to remove all suspicion, and to give perfect content. But unfortunate events, since that time, may make something

further necessary, and not more necessary for the satisfaction of the colonies, than for the dignity and consistency of our own future proceedings.

I have taken a very incorrect measure of the disposition of the House, if this proposal in itself would be received with dislike. I think, sir, we have few American financiers. But our misfortune is, we are too acute; we are too exquisite in our conjectures of the future, for men oppressed with such great and present evils. The more moderate among the opposers of parliamentary concessions freely confess that they hope no good from taxation; but they apprehend the colonists have further views, and, if this point were conceded, they would instantly attack the trade laws. These gentlemen are convinced that this was the intention from the beginning, and the quarrel of the Americans with taxation was no more than a cloak and cover to this design. Such has been the language even of a gentleman [Mr. Rice] of real moderation, and of a natural temper well adjusted to fair and equal government. I am, however, sir, not a little surprised at this kind of discourse, whenever I hear it, and I am the more surprised, on account of the arguments which I constantly find in company with it, and which are often urged from the same mouths and on the same day.

For instance, when we allege that it is against reason to tax a people under so many restraints in trade as the Americans, the noble lord in the blue ribbon shall tell you that the restraints on trade are futile and useless; of no advantage to us, and of no burden to those on whom they are imposed; that the trade of America is not secured by the acts of navigation, but by the natural and irresistible advantage of a commercial preference.

Such is the merit of the trade laws in this posture of the debate. But when strong internal circumstances are urged against the taxes; when the scheme is dissected; when experience and the nature of things are brought to prove, and do prove, the utter impossibility of obtaining an effective revenue from the colonies; when these things are pressed, or rather press themselves, so as to drive the advocates of colony taxes to a clear admission of the futility of the scheme; then, sir, the sleeping trade laws revive from

their trance, and this useless taxation is to be kept sacred, not for its own sake, but as a counterguard and security of the laws of trade.

Then, sir, you keep up revenue laws which are mischievous, in order to preserve trade laws that are useless. Such is the wisdom of our plan in both its members. They are separately given up as of no value, and yet one is always to be defended for the sake of the other. But I cannot agree with the noble lord, nor with the pamphlet from whence he seems to have borrowed these ideas, concerning the inutility of the trade laws; for, without idolizing them, I am sure they are still, in many ways, of great use to us; and in former times they have been of the greatest. They do confine, and they do greatly narrow the market for the Americans; but my perfect conviction of this does not help me in the least to discern how the revenue laws form any security whatsoever to the commercial regulations, or that these commercial regulations are the true ground of the quarrel, or that the giving way in any one instance of authority is to lose all that may remain unconceded.

One fact is clear and indisputable. The public and avowed origin of this quarrel was on taxation. This quarrel has, indeed, brought on new disputes on new questions, but certainly the least bitter, and the fewest of all, on the trade laws. To judge which of the two be the real radical cause of quarrel, we have to see whether the commercial dispute did, in order of time, precede the dispute on taxation. There is not a shadow of evidence for it. Next, to enable us to judge whether at this moment a dislike to the trade laws be the real cause of quarrel, it is absolutely necessary to put the taxes out of the question by a repeal. See how the Americans act in this position, and then you will be able to discern correctly what is the true object of the controversy, or whether any controversy at all will remain. Unless you consent to remove this cause of difference, it is impossible, with decency, to assert that the dispute is not upon what it is avowed to be. And I would, sir, recommend to your serious consideration, whether it be prudent to form a rule for punishing people, not on their own acts, but on your conjectures. Surely it is preposterous at the very best. It is not justifying your anger by

their misconduct, but it is converting your ill-will into their delinquency.

But the colonies will go further. Alas! alas! when will this speculating against fact and reason end? What will quiet these panic fears which we entertain of the hostile effect of a conciliatory conduct? Is it true that no case can exist in which it is proper for the sovereign to accede to the desires of his discontented subjects? Is there anything peculiar in this case to make a rule for itself? Is all authority of course lost, when it is not pushed to the extreme? Is it a certain maxim, that the fewer causes of dissatisfaction are left by government the more the subject will be inclined to resist and rebel?

All these objections being, in fact, no more than suspicions, conjectures, divinations, formed in defiance of fact and experience, they did not, sir, discourage me from entertaining the idea of a conciliatory concession, founded on the principles which I have just stated.

In forming a plan for this purpose, I endeavored to put myself in that frame of mind which was the most natural and the most reasonable, and which was certainly the most probable means of securing me from all error. I set out with a perfect distrust of my own abilities; a total renunciation of every speculation of my own; and with a profound reverence for the wisdom of our ancestors, who have left us the inheritance of so happy a constitution and so flourishing an empire, and, what is a thousand times more valuable, the treasury of the maxims and principles which formed the one and obtained the other.

During the reigns of the kings of Spain of the Austrian family, whenever they were at a loss in the Spanish councils, it was common for their statesmen to say that they ought to consult the genius of Philip II. The genius of Philip II. might mislead them; and the issue of their affairs showed that they had not chosen the most perfect standard. But, sir, I am sure that I shall not be misled when, in a case of constitutional difficulty, I consult the genius of the English Constitution. Consulting at that oracle (it was with all due humility and piety), I found four capital examples in a similar case before me: those of Ireland, Wales, Chester, and Durham.

Ireland, before the English conquest, though never governed by a despotic power, had no parliament. How far the English parliament itself was at that time modeled according to the present form, is disputed among antiquarians. But we have all the reason in the world to be assured that a form of parliament, such as England then enjoyed, she instantly communicated to Ireland; and we are equally sure that almost every successive improvement in constitutional liberty, as fast as it was made here, was transmitted thither. The feudal baronage and the feudal knighthood, the roots of our primitive constitution, were early transplanted into that soil, and grew and flourished there. Magna charta, if it did not give us originally the House of Commons, gave us, at least, a House of Commons of weight and consequence. But your ancestors did not churlishly sit down alone to the feast of magna charta. Ireland was made immediately a partaker. This benefit of English laws and liberties, I confess, was not at first conceded to *all* Ireland. Mark the consequence. English authority and English liberty had exactly the same boundaries. Your standard could never be advanced an inch before your privileges. Sir John Davis shows beyond a doubt that the refusal of a general communication of these rights was the true cause why Ireland was five hundred years in subduing; and after the vain projects of a military government, attempted in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, it was soon discovered that nothing could make that country English, in civility and allegiance, but your laws and your forms of legislature. It was not English arms, but the English Constitution, that conquered Ireland. From that time, Ireland has ever had a general parliament, as she had before a partial parliament. You changed the people; you altered the religion; but you never touched the form or the vital substance of free government in that kingdom. You deposed kings; you restored them; you altered the succession to theirs, as well as to your own crown; but you never altered their Constitution; the principle of which was respected by usurpation; restored with the restoration of monarchy, and established, I trust, forever, by the glorious revolution. This has made Ireland the great and flourishing kingdom that it is; and from a disgrace and a burden

intolerable to this nation, has rendered her a principal part of our strength and ornament. This country cannot be said to have ever formally taxed her. The irregular things done in the confusion of mighty troubles, and on the hinge of great revolutions, even if all were done that is said to have been done, form no example. If they have any effect in argument, they make an exception to prove the rule. None of your own liberties could stand a moment if the casual deviations from them, at such times, were suffered to be used as proofs of their nullity. By the lucrative amount of such casual breaches in the Constitution, judge what the stated and fixed rule of supply has been in that kingdom. Your Irish pensioners would starve, if they had no other fund to live on than taxes granted by English authority. Turn your eyes to those popular grants from which all your great supplies are come, and learn to respect that only source of public wealth in the British empire.

My next example is Wales. This country was said to be reduced by Henry III. It was said more truly to be so by Edward I. But though then conquered, it was not looked upon as any part of the realm of England. Its old constitution, whatever that might have been, was destroyed, and no good one was substituted in its place. The care of that tract was put into the hands of lords marchers—a form of government of a very singular kind; a strange heterogeneous monster, something between hostility and government; perhaps it has a sort of resemblance, according to the modes of those times, to that of commander-in-chief at present, to whom all civil power is granted as secondary. The manners of the Welsh nation followed the genius of the government. The people were ferocious, restive, savage, and uncultivated; sometimes composed, never pacified. Wales, within itself, was in perpetual disorder, and it kept the frontier of England in perpetual alarm. Benefits from it to the state there were none. Wales was only known to England by incursion and invasion.

Sir, during that state of things, parliament was not idle. They attempted to subdue the fierce spirit of the Welsh by all sorts of rigorous laws. They prohibited by statute the sending all sorts of arms into Wales, as you prohibit by

proclamation (with something more of doubt on the legality) the sending arms to America. They disarmed the Welsh by statute, as you attempted (but still with more question on the legality) to disarm New England by an instruction. They made an act to drag offenders from Wales into England for trial, as you have done (but with more hardship) with regard to America. By another act, where one of the parties was an Englishman, they ordained that his trial should be always by English. They made acts to restrain trade, as you do; and they prevented the Welsh from the use of fairs and markets, as you do the Americans from fisheries and foreign ports. In short, when the statute book was not quite so much swelled as it is now, you find no less than fifteen acts of penal regulation on the subject of Wales.

Here we rub our hands—a fine body of precedents for the authority of parliament and the use of it—I admit it fully; and pray add likewise to these precedents, that all the while Wales rid this kingdom like an incubus; that it was an unprofitable and oppressive burden; and that an Englishman traveling in that country could not go six yards from the high-road without being murdered.

The march of the human mind is slow. Sir, it was not until after two hundred years discovered that, by an eternal law, Providence had decreed vexation to violence, and poverty to rapine. Your ancestors did, however, at length open their eyes to the ill husbandry of injustice. They found that the tyranny of a free people could of all tyrannies the least be endured, and that laws made against a whole nation were not the most effectual methods for securing its obedience. Accordingly, in the twenty-seventh year of Henry VIII., the course was entirely altered. With a preamble stating the entire and perfect rights of the crown of England it gave to the Welsh all the rights and privileges of English subjects. A political order was established; the military power gave way to the civil; the marches were turned into counties. But that a nation should have a right to English liberties, and yet no share at all in the fundamental security of these liberties, the grant of their own property, seemed a thing so incongruous, that, eight years after, that is, in the thirty-fifth of

that reign, a complete and not ill-proportioned representation by counties and boroughs was bestowed upon Wales by act of parliament. From that moment, as by a charm, the tumults subsided; obedience was restored; peace, order, and civilization followed in the train of liberty. When the day-star of the English Constitution had arisen in their hearts, all was harmony within and without.

"Simul alba nautis
Stella refulsit,
Defluit saxis agitatus humor:
Concidunt venti, fugiuntque nubes;
Et minax (quod sic voluere) ponto
Unda recumbit."

The very same year the county palatine of Chester received the same relief from its oppressions and the same remedy to its disorders. Before this time Chester was little less distempered than Wales. The inhabitants, without rights themselves, were the fittest to destroy the rights of others; and from thence Richard II. drew the standing army of archers with which for a time he oppressed England. The people of Chester applied to parliament in a petition penned as I shall read to you:

"To the king our sovereign lord, in most humble wise shown unto your excellent majesty, the inhabitants of your grace's county palatine of Chester; that where the said county palatine of Chester is and hath been always hitherto exempt, excluded, and separated out and from your high court of parliament, to have any knights and burgesses within the said court; by reason whereof the said inhabitants have hitherto sustained manifold disherisons, losses, and damages, as well in their lands, goods, and bodies, as in the good, civil, and politic governance and maintenance of the Commonwealth of their said country. (2) And, forasmuch as the said inhabitants have always hitherto been bound by the acts and statutes made and ordained by your said highness and your most noble progenitors, by authority of the said court, as far forth as other counties, cities, and boroughs have been, that have had their knights and burgesses within your said court of parliament, and yet have had neither knight nor burgess there for the said county palatine; the said inhabitants, for lack thereof, have been oftentimes touched and grieved with acts and statutes made within the said court, as well derogatory unto the most ancient jurisdictions, liberties, and privileges of your said county palatine, as prejudicial unto the Com-

monwealth, quietness, rest, and peace of your grace's most bounden subjects inhabiting within the same."

What did parliament with this audacious address? Reject it as a libel? Treat it as an affront to the government? Spurn it as a derogation from the rights of legislature? Did they toss it over the table? Did they burn it by the hands of the common hangman? They took the petition of grievance, all rugged as it was, without softening or temperament, unpurged of the original bitterness and indignation of complaint; they made it the very preamble to their act of redress, and consecrated its principle to all ages in the sanctuary of legislation.

Here is my third example. It was attended with the success of the two former. Chester, civilized as well as Wales, has demonstrated that freedom, and not servitude, is the cure of anarchy; as religion, and not atheism, is the true remedy for superstition. Sir, this pattern of Chester was followed, in the reign of Charles II., with regard to the county palatine of Durham, which is my fourth example. This county had long lain out of the pale of free legislation. So scrupulously was the example of Chester followed, that the style of the preamble is nearly the same with that of the Chester act; and without affecting the abstract extent of the authority of parliament, it recognizes the equity of not suffering any considerable district in which the British subjects may act as a body to be taxed without their own voice in the grant.

Now if the doctrines of policy contained in these preambles, and the force of these examples in the acts of parliament, avail anything, what can be said against applying them with regard to America? Are not the people of America as much Englishmen as the Welsh? The preamble of the act of Henry VIII. says, the Welsh speak a language no way resembling that of his majesty's English subjects. Are the Americans not as numerous? If we may trust the learned and accurate Judge Barrington's account of North Wales, and take that as a standard to measure the rest, there is no comparison. The people cannot amount to above two hundred thousand; not a tenth part of the number in the colonies. Is America in rebellion? Wales was

hardly ever free from it. Have you attempted to govern America by penal statutes? You made fifteen for Wales. But your legislative authority is perfect with regard to America. Was it less perfect in Wales, Chester, and Durham? But America is virtually represented. What! Does the electric force of virtual representation more easily pass over the Atlantic than pervade Wales, which lies in your neighborhood; or than Chester and Durham, surrounded by abundance of representation that is actual and palpable? But, sir, your ancestors thought this sort of virtual representation, however ample, to be totally insufficient for the freedom of the inhabitants of territories that are so near, and comparatively so inconsiderable. How, then, can I think it sufficient for those which are infinitely greater and infinitely more remote?

You will now, sir, perhaps imagine that I am on the point of proposing to you a scheme for representation of the colonies in parliament. Perhaps I might be inclined to entertain some such thought, but a great flood stops me in my course. Opposuit natura. I cannot remove the eternal barriers of the creation. The thing in that mode I do not know to be possible. As I meddle with no theory, I do not absolutely assert the impracticability of such a representation; but I do not see my way to it; and those who have been more confident have not been more successful. However, the arm of public benevolence is not shortened, and there are often several means to the same end. What nature has disjointed in one way wisdom may unite in another. When we cannot give the benefit as we would wish, let us not refuse it altogether. If we cannot give the principal, let us find a substitute. But how? Where? What substitute?

Fortunately I am not obliged for the ways and means of this substitute to tax my own unproductive invention. I am not even obliged to go to the rich treasury of the fertile framers of imaginary commonwealths: not to the Republic of Plato, not to the Utopia of More, not to the Oceana of Harrington. It is before me. It is at my feet.

"And the dull swain
Treads daily on it with his clouted shoon."

I only wish you to recognize, for the theory, the ancient constitutional policy of this kingdom with regard to representation, as that policy has been declared in acts of parliament; and, as to the practise, to return to that mode which a uniform experience has marked out to you as best, and in which you walked with security, advantage, and honor, until the year 1763.

My resolutions, therefore, mean to establish the equity and justice of a taxation of America, by *grant* and not by *imposition*. To mark the legal competency of the colony assemblies for the support of their government in peace, and for public aids in time of war. To acknowledge that this legal competency has had *a dutiful and beneficial exercise;* and that experience has shown the *benefit of their grants*, and the *futility of parliamentary taxation as a method of supply*.

These solid truths compose six fundamental propositions. There are three more resolutions corollary to these. If you admit the first set, you can hardly reject the others. But if you admit the first, I shall be far from solicitous whether you accept or refuse the last. I think these six massive pillars will be of strength sufficient to support the temple of British concord. I have no more doubt than I entertain of my existence, that, if you admitted these, you would command an immediate peace; and, with but tolerable future management, a lasting obedience in America. I am not arrogant in this confident assurance. The propositions are all mere matters of fact; and if they are such facts as draw irresistible conclusions, even in the stating, this is the power of truth, and not any management of mine.

Sir, I shall open the whole plan to you, together with such observations on the motions as may tend to illustrate them where they may want explanation. The first is a resolution:—

"That the colonies and plantations of Great Britain in North America, consisting of fourteen separate governments, and containing two millions and upward of free inhabitants, have not had the liberty and privilege of electing and sending any knights and burgesses or others to represent them in the high court of parliament."

This is a plain matter of fact, necessary to be laid down, and (excepting the description) it is laid down in the language of the Constitution; it is taken nearly verbatim from acts of parliament.

The second is like unto the first:—

"That the said colonies and plantations have been liable to and bounden by several subsidies, payments, rates, and taxes given and granted by parliament, though the said colonies and plantations have not their knights and burgesses in the said high court of parliament, of their own election, to represent the condition of their country; by lack whereof they have been oftentimes touched and grieved by subsidies given, granted, and assented to, in said court, in a manner prejudicial to the commonwealth, quietness, rest, and peace of the subjects inhabiting within the same."

Is this description too hot or too cold, too strong or too weak? Does it arrogate too much to the supreme legislature? Does it lean too much to the claims of the people? If it runs into any of these errors, the fault is not mine. It is the language of your own ancient acts of parliament.

> "Nec meus hic sermo est sed quæ præcepit Ofellus
> Rusticus, abnormis sapiens."

It is the genuine produce of the ancient, rustic, manly, home-bred sense of this country. I did not dare to rub off a particle of the venerable rust that rather adorns and preserves than destroys the metal. It would be a profanation to touch with a tool the stones which construct the sacred altar of peace. I would not violate with modern polish the ingenuous and noble roughness of these truly constitutional materials. Above all things, I was resolved not to be guilty of tampering, the odious vice of restless and unstable minds. I put my foot in the tracks of our forefathers, where I can neither wander nor stumble. Determining to fix articles of peace, I was resolved not to be wise beyond what was written; I was resolved to use nothing else than the form of sound words, to let others abound in their own sense, and carefully to abstain from all expressions of my own. What the law has said, I say. In all things else I am silent. I have no organ but for her words. This, if it be not ingenious, I am sure, is safe.

There are, indeed, words expressive of grievance in this second resolution, which those who are resolved always to be in the right will deny to contain matter of fact, as applied to the present case, although parliament thought them true with regard to the counties of Chester and Durham. They will deny that the Americans were ever "touched and grieved" with the taxes. If they considered nothing in taxes but their weight as pecuniary impositions, there might be some pretense for this denial. But men may be sorely touched and deeply grieved in their privileges as well as in their purses. Men may lose little in property by the act which takes away all their freedom. When a man is robbed of a trifle on the highway, it is not the twopence lost that constitutes the capital outrage. This is not confined to privileges. Even ancient indulgences withdrawn, without offense on the part of those who enjoy such favors, operate as grievances. But were the Americans then not touched and grieved by the taxes, in some measure merely as taxes? If so, why were they almost all either wholly repealed or exceedingly reduced? Were they not touched and grieved, even by the regulating duties of the sixth of George II.? Else why were the duties first reduced to one-third in 1764, and afterward to a third of that third in the year 1766? Were they not touched and grieved by the Stamp Act? I shall say they WERE, until that tax is revived. Were they not touched and grieved by the duties of 1767, which were likewise repealed, and which Lord Hillsborough tells you, for the ministry, were laid contrary to the true principle of commerce? Is not the assurance given by that noble person to the colonies of a resolution to lay no more taxes on them, an admission that taxes would touch and grieve them? Is not the resolution of the noble lord in the blue ribbon, now standing on your journals, the strongest of all proofs that parliamentary subsidies really touched and grieved them? Else why all these changes, modifications, repeals, assurances, and resolutions?

The next proposition is:—

"That, from the distance of the said colonies, and from other circumstances, no method hath hitherto been devised for procuring a representation in parliament for the said colonies."

This is an assertion of a fact. I go no further on the paper; though in my private judgment a useful representation is impossible; I am sure it is not desired by them, nor ought it, perhaps, by us, but I abstain from opinions.

The fourth resolution is:—

"That each of the said colonies hath within itself a body chosen in part or in the whole, by the freemen, freeholders, or other free inhabitants thereof, commonly called the general assembly, or general court, with powers legally to raise, levy, and assess, according to the several usages of such colonies, duties and taxes toward the defraying all sorts of public services."

This competence in the colony assemblies is certain. It is proved by the whole tenor of their acts of supply in all the assemblies, in which the constant style of granting is, "an aid to his majesty"; and acts granting to the crown have regularly for near a century passed the public offices without dispute. Those who have been pleased paradoxically to deny this right, holding that none but the British parliament can grant to the crown, are wished to look to what is done, not only in the colonies, but in Ireland, in one uniform, unbroken tenor every session.

Sir, I am surprised that this doctrine should come from some of the law servants of the crown. I say that if the crown could be responsible, his majesty—but certainly the ministers, and even these law officers themselves, through whose hands the acts pass biennially in Ireland, or annually in the colonies, are in a habitual course of committing impeachable offenses. What habitual offenders have been all presidents of the council, all secretaries of state, all first lords of trade, all attorneys, and all solicitors-general! However, they are safe, as no one impeaches them; and there is no ground of charge against them, except in their own unfounded theories.

The fifth resolution is also a resolution of fact:—

"That the said general assemblies, general courts, or other bodies legally qualified as aforesaid, have at sundry times freely granted several large subsidies and public aids for his majesty's service, according to their abilities when required thereto by letter from one of his majesty's principal secretaries of state. And that their right to grant the same,

and their cheerfulness and sufficiency in the said grants, have been at sundry times acknowledged by parliament."

To say nothing of their great expenses in the Indian wars; and not to take their exertion in foreign ones, so high as the supplies in the year 1695, not to go back to their public contributions in the year 1710, I shall begin to travel only where the journals give me light; resolving to deal in nothing but fact authenticated by parliamentary record, and to build myself wholly on that solid basis.

On the fourth of April, 1748, a committee of this house came to the following resolution:—

"*Resolved*, That it is the opinion of this committee, *that it is just and reasonable* that the several provinces and colonies of Massachusetts Bay, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, be reimbursed the expenses they have been at in taking and securing to the Crown of Great Britain the island of Cape Breton and its dependencies."

These expenses were immense for such colonies. They were above £200,000 sterling; money first raised and advanced on their public credit.

On the twenty-eighth of January, 1756, a message from the king came to us to this effect:—

"His majesty being sensible of the zeal and vigor with which his faithful subjects of certain colonies in North America have exerted themselves in defense of his majesty's just rights and possessions, recommends it to this house to take the same into their consideration, and to enable his majesty to give them such assistance as may be a *proper reward and encouragement.*"

On the third of February, 1756, the house came to a suitable resolution, expressed in words nearly the same as those of the message; but with the further addition, that the money then voted was an encouragement to the colonies to exert themselves with vigor. It will not be necessary to go through all the testimonies which your own records have given to the truth of my resolutions. I will only refer you to the places in the journals: Vol. xxvii., May 16 and 19, 1757; Vol. xxviii., June 1, 1758—April 26 and 30, 1759—March 26 and 31, and April 28, 1760—January 9 and

20, 1761; Vol. xxix., January 22 and 26, 1762—March 14 and 17, 1763.

Sir, here is the repeated acknowledgment of parliament, that the colonies not only gave, but gave to satiety. This nation has formally acknowledged two things: first, that the colonies have gone beyond their abilities, parliament having thought it necessary to reimburse them; secondly, that they had acted legally and laudably in their grants of money, and their maintenance of troops, since the compensation is expressly given as reward and encouragement. Reward is not bestowed for acts that are unlawful; and encouragement is not held out to things that deserve reprehension. My resolution, therefore, does nothing more than collect into one proposition what is scattered through your journals. I give you nothing but your own, and you cannot refuse in the gross what you have so often acknowledged in detail. The admission of this, which will be so honorable to them and to you, will, indeed, be mortal to all the miserable stories by which the passions of the misguided people have been engaged in an unhappy system. The people heard, indeed, from the beginning of these disputes, one thing continually dinned in their ears, that reason and justice demanded that the Americans, who paid no taxes, should be compelled to contribute. How did that fact of their paying nothing stand when the taxing system began? When Mr. Grenville began to form his system of American revenue, he stated in this house that the colonies were then in debt two million six hundred thousand pounds sterling money, and was of opinion they would discharge that debt in four years. On this state, those untaxed people were actually subject to the payment of taxes to the amount of six hundred and fifty thousand a year. In fact, however, Mr. Grenville was mistaken. The funds given for sinking the debt did not prove quite so ample as both the colonies and he expected. The calculation was too sanguine: the reduction was not completed till some years after, and at different times in different colonies. However, the taxes after the war continued too great to bear any addition, with prudence or propriety; and when the burdens imposed in consequence of former requisitions were discharged, our tone became too high to resort again to

requisition. No colony, since that time, ever has had any requisition whatsoever made to it.

We see the sense of the crown, and the sense of parliament, on the productive nature of a revenue by grant. Now search the same journals for the produce of the revenue by imposition. Where is it? Let us know the volume and the page. What is the gross, what is the net produce? To what service is it applied? How have you appropriated its surplus? What, can none of the many skilful index-makers that we are now employing find any trace of it? Well, let them and that rest together. But are the journals, which say nothing of the revenue, as silent on the discontent? Oh, no! a child may find it. It is the melancholy burden and blot of every page.

I think, then, I am, from those journals, justified in the sixth and last resolution, which is:—

> "That it hath been found by experience that the manner of granting the said supplies and aids, by the said general assemblies, hath been more agreeable to the said colonies, and more beneficial and conducive to the public service, than the mode of giving and granting aids in parliament, to be raised and paid in the said colonies."

This makes the whole of the fundamental part of the plan. The conclusion is irresistible. You cannot say that you were driven by any necessity to an exercise of the utmost rights of legislature. You cannot assert that you took on yourselves the task of imposing colony taxes, from the want of another legal body, that is competent to the purpose of supplying the exigencies of the state without wounding the prejudices of the people. Neither is it true that the body so qualified, and having that competence, had neglected the duty.

The question now on all this accumulated matter is—whether you will choose to abide by a profitable experience or a mischievous theory; whether you choose to build on imagination or fact; whether you prefer enjoyment or hope; satisfaction in your subjects or discontent?

If these propositions are accepted, everything which has been made to enforce a contrary system must, I take it for granted, fall along with it. On that ground I have

drawn the following resolution, which, when it comes to be moved, will naturally be divided in a proper manner:—

"That it may be proper to repeal an act, made in the seventh year of the reign of his present majesty, entitled, An act for granting certain duties in the British colonies and plantations in America; for allowing a drawback of the duties of customs upon the exportation from this kingdom of coffee and cocoanuts of the produce of the said colonies or plantations; for discontinuing the drawbacks payable on china earthenware exported to America, and for more effectually preventing the clandestine running of goods in the said colonies and plantations; and that it may be proper to repeal an act, made in the fourteenth year of the reign of his present majesty, entitled, An act to discontinue, in such manner, and for such time as are therein mentioned, the landing and discharging, lading, or shipping, of goods, wares, and merchandise, at the town and within the harbor of Boston, in the province of Massachusetts Bay, in North America; and that it may be proper to repeal an act made in the fourteenth year of the reign of his present majesty, entitled, An act for the impartial administration of justice in the cases of persons, questioned for any acts done by them in the execution of the law, or for the suppression of riots and tumults in the province of Massachusetts Bay, in New England; and that it may be proper to repeal an act, made in the fourteenth year of the reign of his present majesty, entitled, An act for the better regulating the government of the province of Massachusetts Bay, in New England; and also, that it may be proper to explain and amend an act, made in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of King Henry the Eighth, entitled, An act for the trial of treasons committed out of the king's dominions."

I wish, sir, to repeal the Boston Port Bill, because (independently of the dangerous precedent of suspending the rights of the subject during the king's pleasure) it was passed, as I apprehend, with less regularity, and on more partial principles, than it ought. The corporation of Boston was not heard before it was condemned. Other towns, full as guilty as she was, have not had their ports blocked up. Even the restraining bill of the present session does not go to the length of the Boston Port Act. The same ideas of prudence which induced you not to extend equal punishment to equal guilt, even when you were punishing, induce me, who mean not to chastise, but to reconcile, to be satisfied with the punishment already partially inflicted.

Ideas of prudence, and accommodation to circumstances,

prevent you from taking away the charters of Connecticut and Rhode Island, as you have taken away that of Massachusetts Colony, though the crown has far less power in the two former provinces than it enjoyed in the latter; and though the abuses have been full as great and as flagrant in the exempted as in the punished. The same reasons of prudence and accommodation have weight with me in restoring the charter of Massachusetts Bay. Besides, sir, the act which changes the charter of Massachusetts is in many particulars so exceptionable, that if I did not wish absolutely to repeal, I would by all means desire to alter it, as several of its provisions tend to the subversion of all public and private justice. Such, among others, is the power in the governor to change the sheriff at his pleasure, and to make a new returning officer for every special cause. It is shameful to behold such a regulation standing among English laws.

The act for bringing persons accused of committing murder under the orders of government to England for trial, is but temporary. That act has calculated the probable duration of our quarrel with the colonies, and is accommodated to that supposed duration. I would hasten the happy moment of reconciliation, and therefore must, on my principle, get rid of that most justly obnoxious act.

The act of Henry VIII., for the trial of treasons, I do not mean to take away, but to confine it to its proper bounds and original intention; to make it expressly for trial of treasons (and the greatest treasons may be committed) in places where the jurisdiction of the crown does not extend.

Having guarded the privileges of local legislature, I would next secure to the colonies a fair and unbiased judicature; for which purpose, sir, I propose the following resolution:—

"That, from the time when the general assembly or general court of any colony or plantation in North America, shall have appointed by act of assembly, duly confirmed, a settled salary to the offices of the chief justice and other judges of the superior court, it may be proper that the said chief justice and other judges of the superior courts of such colony, shall hold his and their office and offices during their good behavior, and shall not be removed therefrom, but when the said removal shall be adjudged by his majesty in council, upon a hearing on com-

plaint from the general assembly, or on a complaint from the governor, or council, or the House of Representatives severally, of the colony in which the said chief justice and other judges have exercised the said offices."

The next resolution relates to the courts of admiralty. It is this:—

"That it may be proper to regulate the courts of admiralty, or vice-admiralty, authorized by the 15th chapter of the fourth of George the Third, in such a manner as to make the same more commodious to those who sue, or are sued, in the said courts, and to provide for the more decent maintenance of the judges in the same."

These courts I do not wish to take away. They are in themselves proper establishments. This court is one of the capital securities of the act of navigation. The extent of its jurisdiction, indeed, has been increased; but this is altogether as proper, and is, indeed, on many accounts, more eligible, where new powers were wanted, than a court absolutely new. But courts incommodiously situated, in effect, deny justice; and a court, partaking in the fruits of its own condemnation, is a robber. The Congress complain, and complain justly, of this grievance.

These are the three consequential propositions. I have thought of two or three more, but they come rather too near detail, and to the province of executive government, which I wish parliament always to superintend, never to assume. If the first six are granted, congruity will carry the latter three. If not, the things that remain unrepealed will be, I hope, rather unseemly encumbrances on the building, than very materially detrimental to its strength and stability.

Here, sir, I should close, but that I plainly perceive some objections remain, which I ought, if possible, to remove. The first will be, that, in resorting to the doctrine of our ancestors, as contained in the preamble to the Chester act, I prove too much; that the grievance from a want of representation stated in that preamble goes to the whole of legislation as well as to taxation. And that the colonies, grounding themselves upon that doctrine, will apply it to all parts of legislative authority.

To this objection, with all possible deference and humility, and wishing as little as any man living to impair the smallest particle of our supreme authority, I answer, that the words are the words of parliament, and not mine; and that all false and inconclusive inferences drawn from them are not mine, for I heartily disclaim any such inference. I have chosen the words of an act of parliament, which Mr. Grenville, surely a tolerably zealous and very judicious advocate for the sovereignty of parliament, formerly moved to have read at your table, in confirmation of his tenets. It is true that Lord Chatham considered these preambles as declaring strongly in favor of his opinions. He was a no less powerful advocate for the privileges of the Americans. Ought I not from hence to presume that these preambles are as favorable as possible to both, when properly understood; favorable both to the rights of parliament, and to the privilege of the dependencies of this crown? But, sir, the object of grievance in my resolution I have not taken from the Chester, but from the Durham act, which confines the hardship of want of representation to the case of subsidies, and which, therefore, falls in exactly with the case of the colonies. But whether the unrepresented counties were de jure or de facto bound, the preambles do not accurately distinguish; nor indeed was it necessary; for, whether de jure or de facto, the legislature thought the exercise of the power of taxing, as of right, or as of fact without right, equally a grievance and equally oppressive.

I do not know that the colonies have, in any general way, or in any cool hour, gone much beyond the demand of immunity in relation to taxes. It is not fair to judge of the temper or dispositions of any man, or any set of men, when they are composed and at rest, from their conduct or their expressions in a state of disturbance and irritation. It is, besides, a very great mistake to imagine that mankind follow up practically any speculative principle, either of government or of freedom, as far as it will go in argument and logical illation. We Englishmen stop very short of the principles upon which we support any given part of our Constitution, or even the whole of it together. I could easily, if I had not already tired you, give you very striking and convincing instances of it. This is nothing but what is

natural and proper. All government, indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act, is founded on compromise and barter. We balance inconveniences; we give and take; we remit some rights that we may enjoy others; and we choose rather to be happy citizens than subtle disputants. As we must give away some natural liberty to enjoy civil advantages, so we must sacrifice some civil liberties for the advantages to be derived from the communion and fellowship of a great empire. But, in all fair dealings, the thing bought must bear some proportion to the purchase paid. None will barter away "the immediate jewel of his soul." Though a great house is apt to make slaves haughty, yet it is purchasing a part of the artificial importance of a great empire too dear to pay for it all essential rights and all the intrinsic dignity of human nature. None of us who would not risk his life rather than fall under a government purely arbitrary. But, although there are some among us who think our Constitution wants many improvements to make it a complete system of liberty, perhaps none who are of that opinion would think it right to aim at such improvement by disturbing his country, and risking everything that is dear to him. In every arduous enterprise we consider what we are to lose as well as what we are to gain; and the more and better stake of liberty every people possess, the less they will hazard in a vain attempt to make it more. These are "the cords of man." Man acts from adequate motive relative to his interest, and not on metaphysical speculations. Aristotle, the great master of reasoning, cautions us, and with great weight and propriety, against this species of delusive geometrical accuracy in moral arguments as the most fallacious of all sophistry.

The Americans will have no interest contrary to the grandeur and glory of England, when they are not oppressed by the weight of it; and they will rather be inclined to respect the acts of a superintending legislature, when they see them the acts of that power which is itself the security, not the rival, of their secondary importance. In this assurance my mind most perfectly acquiesces, and I confess I feel not the least alarm from the discontents which are to arise from putting people at their ease; nor do I

apprehend the destruction of this empire from giving, by an act of free grace and indulgence, to two millions of my fellow citizens, some share of those rights upon which I have always been taught to value myself.

It is said, indeed, that this power of granting, vested in American assemblies, would dissolve the unity of the empire, which was preserved entire, although Wales, and Chester, and Durham were added to it. Truly, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what this unity means, nor has it ever been heard of, that I know, in the constitutional policy of this country. The very idea of subordination of parts excludes this notion of simple and undivided unity. England is the head, but she is not the head and the members too. Ireland has ever had from the beginning a separate, but not an independent legislature, which, far from distracting, promoted the union of the whole. Everything was sweetly and harmoniously disposed through both islands for the conservation of English dominion and the communication of English liberties. I do not see that the same principles might not be carried into twenty islands, and with the same good effect. This is my model with regard to America, as far as the internal circumstances of the two countries are the same. I know no other unity of this empire than I can draw from its example during these periods, when it seemed to my poor understanding more united than it is now, or than it is likely to be by the present methods.

But since I speak of these methods, I recollect, Mr. Speaker, almost too late, that I promised, before I finished, to say something of the proposition of the noble lord [Lord North] on the floor, which has been so lately received, and stands on your journals. I must be deeply concerned whenever it is my misfortune to continue a difference with the majority of this house. But as the reasons for that difference are my apology for thus troubling you, suffer me to state them in a very few words. I shall compress them into as small a body as I possibly can, having already debated that matter at large when the question was before the committee.

First, then, I cannot admit that proposition of a ransom by auction, because it is a mere project. It is a thing new;

unheard of; supported by no experience; justified by no analogy; without example of our ancestors, or root in the Constitution. It is neither regular parliamentary taxation nor colony grant. "Experimentum in corpore vili" is a good rule, which will ever make me adverse to any trial of experiments on what is certainly the most valuable of all subjects, the peace of this empire.

Secondly, it is an experiment which must be fatal, in the end, to our Constitution. For what is it but a scheme for taxing the colonies in the antechamber of the noble lord and his successors. To settle the quotas and proportions in this house is clearly impossible. You, sir, may flatter yourself you shall sit a state auctioneer with your hammer in your hand, and knock down to each colony as it bids. But to settle (on the plan laid down by the noble lord) the true proportional payment for four or five-and-twenty governments according to the absolute and the relative wealth of each, and according to the British proportion of wealth and burden, is a wild and chimerical notion. This new taxation must therefore come in by the back door of the Constitution. Each quota must be brought to this house ready formed; you can neither add nor alter. You must register it. You can do nothing further. For on what grounds can you deliberate, either before or after the proposition? You cannot hear the counsel for all these provinces, quarreling each on its own quantity of payment, and its proportion to others. If you should attempt it, the committee of provincial ways and means, or by whatever other name it will delight to be called, must swallow up all the time of parliament.

Thirdly, it does not give satisfaction to the complaint of the colonies. They complain that they are taxed without their consent; you answer, that you will fix the sum at which they shall be taxed. That is, you give them the very grievance for the remedy. You tell them, indeed, that you will leave the mode to themselves. I really beg pardon. It gives me pain to mention it; but you must be sensible that you will not perform this part of the contract. For, suppose the colonies were to lay the duties which furnished their contingent upon the importation of your manufactures? you know you would never suffer such a tax to

be laid. You know, too, that you would not suffer many other modes of taxation; so that when you come to explain yourself, it will be found that you will neither leave to themselves the quantum nor the mode, nor, indeed, anything. The whole is delusion from one end to the other.

Fourthly, this method of ransom by auction, unless it be universally accepted, will plunge you into great and inextricable difficulties. In what year of our Lord are the proportions of payments to be settled, to say nothing of the impossibility that colony agents should have general powers of taxing the colonies at their discretion? Consider, I implore you, that the communication by special messages, and orders between these agents and their constituents on each variation of the case, when the parties come to contend together, and to dispute on their relative proportions, will be a matter of delay, perplexity, and confusion that never can have an end.

If all the colonies do not appear at the outcry, what is the condition of those assemblies who offer, by themselves or their agents, to tax themselves up to your ideas of their proportion? The refractory colonies who refuse all composition will remain taxed only to your old impositions, which, however grievous in principle, are trifling as to production. The obedient colonies in this scheme are heavily taxed; the refractory remain unburdened. What will you do? Will you lay new and heavier taxes by parliament on the disobedient? Pray consider in what way you can do it. You are perfectly convinced that in the way of taxing you can do nothing but at the ports. Now suppose it is Virginia that refuses to appear at your auction, while Maryland and North Carolina bid handsomely for their ransom, and are taxed to your quota. How will you put these colonies on a par? Will you tax the tobacco of Virginia? If you do, you give its death-wound to your English revenue at home, and to one of the very greatest articles of your own foreign trade. If you tax the import of that rebellious colony, what do you tax but your own manufactures, or the goods of some other obedient and already well-taxed colony? Who has said one word on this labyrinth of detail, which bewilders you more and more as you enter into it? Who has presented, who can present you with a clue to lead

you out of it? I think, sir, it is impossible that you should not recollect that the colony bounds are so implicated in one another (you know it by your own experiments in the bill for prohibiting the New England fishery) that you can lay no possible restraints on almost any of them which may not be presently eluded, if you do not confound the innocent with the guilty, and burden those whom, upon every principle, you ought to exonerate. He must be grossly ignorant of America who thinks that, without falling into this confusion of all rules of equity and policy, you can restrain any single colony, especially Virginia and Maryland, the central and most important of them all.

Let it also be considered, that either in the present confusion you settle a permanent contingent which will and must be trifling, and then you have no effectual revenue; or, you change the quota at every exigency, and then on every new repartition you will have a new quarrel.

Reflect, besides, that when you have fixed a quota for every colony, you have not provided for prompt and punctual payment. Suppose one, two, five, ten years arrears. You cannot issue a treasury extent against the failing colony. You must make new Boston Port bills, new restraining laws, new acts for dragging men to England for trial. You must send out new fleets, new armies. All is to begin again. From this day forward the empire is never to know an hour's tranquillity. An intestine fire will be kept alive in the bowels of the colonies, which one time or another must consume this whole empire. I allow, indeed, that the empire of Germany raises her revenue and her troops by quotas and contingents; but the revenue of the empire, and the army of the empire, is the worst revenue and the worst army in the world.

Instead of a standing revenue, you will therefore have a perpetual quarrel. Indeed, the noble lord who proposed this project of a ransom by auction, seemed himself to be of that opinion. His project was rather designed for breaking the union of the colonies than for establishing a revenue. He confessed that he apprehended that his proposal would not be to their taste. I say this scheme of disunion seems to be at the bottom of the project; for I will not suspect that the noble lord meant nothing but merely to

delude the nation by an airy phantom which he never intended to realize. But, whatever his views may be, as I propose the peace and union of the colonies as the very foundation of my plan, it cannot accord with one whose foundation is perpetual discord.

Compare the two. This I offer to give you is plain and simple. The other, full of perplexed and intricate mazes. This is mild; that, harsh. This is found by experience effectual for its purposes; the other is a new project. This is universal; the other, calculated for certain colonies only. This is immediate in its conciliatory operation; the other, remote, contingent, full of hazard. Mine is what becomes the dignity of a ruling people; gratuitous, unconditional, and not held out as a matter of bargain and sale. I have done my duty in proposing it to you. I have indeed tired you by a long discourse; but this is the misfortune of those to whose influence nothing will be conceded, and who must win every inch of their ground by argument. You have heard me with goodness. May you decide with wisdom! For my part, I feel my mind greatly disburdened by what I have done to-day. I have been the less fearful of trying your patience, because on this subject I mean to spare it altogether in future. I have this comfort, that in every stage of the American affairs, I have steadily opposed the measures that have produced the confusion, and may bring on the destruction of this empire. I now go so far as to risk a proposal of my own. If I cannot give peace to my country, I give it to my conscience.

But what, says the financier, is peace to us without money? Your plan gives us no revenue. No! But it does —for it secures to the subject the power of REFUSAL— the first of all revenues. Experience is a cheat, and fact a liar, if this power in the subject of proportioning his grant, or of not granting at all, has not been found the richest mine of revenue ever discovered by the skill or by the fortune of man. It does not indeed vote you £152,750 11*s.* 2¾*d.*, nor any other paltry limited sum, but it gives the strong box itself, the fund, the bank, from whence only revenues can arise among a people sensible of freedom: Posita luditur arca.

Cannot you in England; cannot you at this time of day;

cannot you—a House of Commons—trust to the principle which has raised so mighty a revenue, and accumulated a debt of near one hundred and forty millions in this country? Is this principle to be true in England and false everywhere else? Is it not true in Ireland? Has it not hitherto been true in the colonies? Why should you presume, that in any country, a body duly constituted for any functions will neglect to perform its duty, and abdicate its trust. Such a presumption would go against all government in all modes. But, in truth, this dread of penury of supply, from a free assembly, has no foundation in nature. For first observe, that, besides the desire, which all men have naturally, of supporting the honor of their own government, that sense of dignity, and that security of property, which ever attends freedom, has a tendency to increase the stock of the free community. Most may be taken where most is accumulated. And what is the soil or climate where experience has not uniformly proved that the voluntary flow of heaped-up plenty, bursting from the weight of its own rich luxuriance, has ever run with a more copious stream of revenue, than could be squeezed from the dry husks of oppressed indigence, by the straining of all the politic machinery in the world.

Next, we know that parties must ever exist in a free country. We know, too, that the emulations of such parties, their contradictions, their reciprocal necessities, their hopes and their fears, must send them all in their turns to him that holds the balance of the state. The parties are the gamesters, but government keeps the table, and is sure to be the winner in the end. When this game is played, I really think it is more to be feared that the people will be exhausted than that government will not be supplied; whereas, whatever is got by acts of absolute power, ill obeyed, because odious, or by contracts ill kept, because constrained, will be narrow, feeble, uncertain, and precarious.

"Ease would retract
Vows made in pain, as violent and void."

I, for one, protest against compounding our demands. I declare against compounding, for a poor, limited sum, the

immense, ever-growing, eternal debt which is due to generous government from protected freedom. And so may I speed in the great object I propose to you, as I think it would not only be an act of injustice, but would be the worst economy in the world, to compel the colonies to a sum certain, either in the way of ransom or in the way of compulsory compact.

But to clear up my ideas on this subject: A revenue from America transmitted hither—do not delude yourselves—you never can receive it—no, not a shilling. We have experienced that from remote countries it is not to be expected. If, when you attempted to extract revenue from Bengal, you were obliged to return in loan what you had taken in imposition, what can you expect from North America? for certainly, if ever there was a country qualified to produce wealth, it is India; or an institution fit for the transmission, it is the East India Company. America has none of these aptitudes. If America gives you taxable objects on which you lay your duties here, and gives you, at the same time, a surplus by a foreign sale of her commodities to pay the duties on these objects which you tax at home, she has performed her part to the British revenue. But with regard to her own internal establishments, she may, I doubt not she will, contribute in moderation; I say in moderation, for she ought not to be permitted to exhaust herself. She ought to be reserved to a war, the weight of which, with the enemies that we are most likely to have, must be considerable in her quarter of the globe. There she may serve you, and serve you essentially.

For that service, for all service, whether of revenue, trade, or empire, my trust is in her interest in the British Constitution. My hold of the colonies is in the close affection which grows from common names, from kindred blood, from similar privileges, and equal protection. These are ties which, though light as air, are as strong as links of iron. Let the colonies always keep the idea of their civil rights associated with your government; they will cling and grapple to you, and no force under heaven will be of power to tear them from their allegiance. But let it be once understood that your government may be one thing, and their privileges another; that these two things may exist

without any mutual relation; the cement is gone; the cohesion is loosened; and everything hastens to decay and dissolution. As long as you have the wisdom to keep the sovereign authority of this country as the sanctuary of liberty, the sacred temple consecrated to our common faith, wherever the chosen race and sons of England worship freedom, they will turn their faces toward you. The more they multiply, the more friends you will have. The more ardently they love liberty, the more perfect will be their obedience. Slavery they can have anywhere. It is a weed that grows in every soil. They may have it from Spain; they may have it from Prussia; but, until you become lost to all feeling of your true interest and your natural dignity, freedom they can have from none but you. This is the commodity of price, of which you have the monopoly. This is the true Act of Navigation, which binds to you the commerce of the colonies, and through them secures to you the wealth of the world. Deny them this participation of freedom, and you break that sole bond which originally made, and must still preserve, the unity of the empire. Do not entertain so weak an imagination as that your registers and your bonds, your affidavits and your sufferances, your cóckets and your clearances, are what form the great securities of your commerce. Do not dream that your letters of office, and your instructions, and your suspending clauses, are the things that hold together the great contexture of this mysterious whole. These things do not make your government. Dead instruments, passive tools as they are, it is the spirit of the English communion that gives all their life and efficacy to them. It is the spirit of the English Constitution which, infused through the mighty mass, pervades, feeds, unites, invigorates, vivifies every part of the empire, even down to the minutest member.

Is it not the same virtue which does everything for us here in England?

Do you imagine, then, that it is the land tax which raises your revenue, that it is the annual vote in the committee of supply which gives you your army? or that it is the mutiny bill which inspires it with bravery and discipline? No! surely no! It is the love of the people; it is their attachment to their government, from the sense of the

deep stake they have in such a glorious institution, which gives you your army and your navy, and infuses into both that liberal obedience, without which your army would be a base rabble, and your navy nothing but rotten timber.

All this, I know well enough, will sound wild and chimerical to the profane herd of those vulgar and mechanical politicians, who have no place among us; a sort of people who think that nothing exists but what is gross and material, and who, therefore, far from being qualified to be directors of the great movement of empire, are not fit to turn a wheel in the machine. But to men truly initiated and rightly taught, these ruling and master principles, which, in the opinion of such men as I have mentioned, have no substantial existence, are in truth everything and all in all. Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom; and a great empire and little minds go ill together. If we are conscious of our situation, and glow with zeal to fill our place as becomes our station and ourselves, we ought to auspicate all our public proceeding on America with the old warning of the church, sursum corda! We ought to elevate our minds to the greatness of that trust to which the order of Providence has called us. By adverting to the dignity of this high calling, our ancestors have turned a savage wilderness into a glorious empire, and have made the most extensive and the only honorable conquests, not by destroying, but by promoting, the wealth, the number, the happiness of the human race. Let us get an American revenue as we have got an American empire. English privileges have made it all that it is; English privileges alone will make it all it can be.

In full confidence of this unalterable truth, I now, quod felix faustumque sit, lay the first stone in the temple of peace; and I move you,

That the colonies and plantations of Great Britain in North America, consisting of fourteen separate governments, and containing two millions and upwards of free inhabitants, have not had the liberty and privilege of electing and sending any knights and burgesses, or others, to represent them in the high court of parliament.

ANSON BURLINGAME

MASSACHUSETTS AND SUMNER

[Anson Burlingame, an American diplomatist, distinguished for the cultivated tone of his oratory, was born in New York State in 1820. He was graduated at Harvard and began the practice of law in Boston, and for six years represented a Massachusetts district in Congress. He was challenged to a duel by Preston S. Brooks, the assaliant of Charles Sumner, and accepted, but the meeting never took place. President Lincoln sent him on a diplomatic mission to China, where he gained such an ascendency over the native mind that he was made China's ambassador to the world's leading powers and negotiated treaties for her with them. He died in Russia during his Chinese mission in 1870. The following speech was occasioned by Brooks's assault upon Sumner, and was made in the House of Representatives in 1856.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will bear witness that I have not pressed myself upon its deliberations. I never before asked its indulgence. I have assailed no man; nor have I sought to bring reproach upon any man's state. But, while such has been my course, as well as the course of my colleagues from Massachusetts, upon this floor, certain members have seen fit to assail the state which we represent, not only with words, but with blows.

In remembrance of these things, and seizing the first opportunity which has presented itself for a long time, I stand here to-day to say a word for old Massachusetts—not that she needs it; no, sir; for in all that constitutes true greatness—in all that gives abiding strength—in great qualities of head and heart—in moral power—in material prosperity—in intellectual resources and physical ability—by the general judgment of mankind, according to her population, she is the first state.

There does not live the man anywhere who knows anything to whom praise of Massachusetts would not be need-

less. She is as far beyond that as she is beyond censure. Members here may sneer at her; they may praise her past at the expense of her present; but I say, with a full conviction of its truth, that Massachusetts, in her present performances, is even greater than in her past recollections. And when I have said this, what more can I say?

Sir, although I am here as her youngest and humblest member, yet, as her representative, I feel that I am the peer of any man upon this floor. Occupying that high standpoint with modesty, but with firmness, I cast down her glove to the whole band of her assailants.

She has been assailed in the House and out of the House, at the other end of the Capitol and at the other end of the avenue. There have been brought against her general charges and specific charges. I am sorry to find at the head of the list of her assailants the President of the United States, who not only assails Massachusetts, but the whole North. He defends one section of the Union at the expense of the other. He declares that one section has ever been mindful of its constitutional obligations and that the other has not. He declares that if one section of our country were a foreign country the other would have just cause of war against it.

And to sustain these remarkable declarations he goes into an elaborate perversion of history, such as that Virginia ceded her lands against the interests of the South for the benefit of the North; when the truth is, she ceded her lands, as New York and other States did, for the benefit of the whole country. She gave her lands to freedom, because she thought freedom was better than slavery; because it was the policy of the times, and events have vindicated that policy.

It is a perversion of history when he says that the territory of the country has been acquired more for the benefit of the North than for the South; he says that substantially. Sir, out of the territory thus acquired five slave states, with a pledge for four more, and two free states have come into the Union; and one of these, as we all know, fought its way through a compromise degrading to the North.

The North does not object to the acquisition of territory when it is desired, but she desires that it shall be free. If

such a complexion had been given to it, how different would have been the fortunes of the republic to-day! This may be ascertained by comparing the progress of Ohio with that of any slave state in the Mississippi Valley. It will appear more clearly by comparing the free with the slave regions. I have not time to do more than to present a general picture.

Freedom and slavery started together in the great race on this continent. In the very year the Pilgrim Fathers landed on Plymouth Rock, slaves landed in Virginia. Freedom has gone on, trampling down barbarism and planting states—building the symbols of its faith by every lake and every river, until now the sons of the Pilgrims stand by the shores of the Pacific. Slavery has also made its way toward the setting sun. It has reached the Rio Grande on the south; and the groans of its victims and the clank of its chains may be heard as it slowly ascends the western tributaries of the Mississippi River.

Freedom has left the land bespangled with free schools, and filled the whole heavens with the shining towers of religion and civilization. Slavery has left desolation, ignorance, and death in its path. When we look at these things; when we see what the country would have been had freedom been given to the territories; when we think what it would have been but for this blight in the bosom of the country; that the whole South—that fair land God has blessed so much—would have been covered with cities, and villages, and railroads, and that in the country, in the place of twenty-five millions of people, thirty-five millions would have hailed the rising morn, exulting in republican liberty; when we think of these things, how must every honest man —how must every man with brains in his head or heart in his bosom—regret that the policy of old Virginia in her better days did not become the animating policy of this expanding republic!

It is a perversion of history, I say, when the President intimates that the adoption of the Constitution abrogated the ordinance of 1787. It was recognized by the first Congress which assembled under the Constitution; and it has been sanctioned by nearly every President from Washington down.

It is a perversion of history when the President intimates that the Missouri Compromise was made against the interests of the South and for the benefit of the North. The truth—the unmistakable truth—is that it was forced by the South on the North. It received the almost united vote of the South. It was claimed as a victory of the South.

The men who voted for it were sustained in the South; and those who voted for it in the North passed into oblivion; and though some of them are physically alive, to-day they are as politically dead as are the President and his immediate advisers.

Not only has the President perverted history, but he has turned sectionalist. He has become the champion of sectionalism. He makes the extraordinary declaration that if a state is refused admission into the Union because her constitution embraced slavery as an institution, then one section of the country would of necessity be compelled to dissolve its connection with the people of the other section!

What does he mean? Does he mean to say that there are traitors in the South? Does he mean to say if they were voted down that then they ought not to submit? If he does, and if they mean to back him in the declaration, then I say the quicker we try the strength of this great government the better. Not only has he said that, but members have said on this floor again and again that if the Fugitive Slave Law, which has nothing sacred about it—which I deem unconstitutional—which South Carolina deems unconstitutional—if that law be repealed that this Union will then cease to exist.

I say that it is not for the President and members on this floor to determine the life of this Union; this Union rests in the hearts of the American people and cannot be eradicated thence. Whenever any person shall lift his hand to smite down this Union the people will subjugate him to liberty and the Constitution. I do not wish to dwell on the President and what he has said. Notwithstanding all this perversion of history—notwithstanding his violated pledges—and notwithstanding his warlike exploits at Greytown and Lawrence—his servility has been repaid with scorn.

I am glad of it. The South was right. When a man is

false to the convictions of his own heart and to freedom, he cannot be trusted with the delicate interests of slavery. I cannot express the delight I feel in the poetic justice that has been done; but at the same time I am not unmindful of the deep ingratitude that first lured him to ruin, and then deserted and left him alone to die.

If I were not too much of a native American I would quote and apply to him the old Latin words, De mortuis nil nisi bonum.* I can almost forgive him, considering his condition, the blistering words he let fall upon us the other night when he went through the ordeal of ratifying the nomination of James Buchanan. He said that we had received nothing at the hands of the government save its protection and its political blessings. We have not certainly received any offices; and as for its protection and political blessings, let the silence above the graves of those who sleep in their bloody shrouds in Kansas answer.

There have been general and specific charges made against old Massachusetts. The general charge when expressed in polite language is that she has not been faithful to her constitutional obligations. I deny it. I call for proof. I ask when? where? how? I say, on the contrary, that from the time when this government came from the brains of her statesmen and the unconquerable arms of her warriors, she has been loyal to it.

In peace she has added to it renown; and in war her sons have crowded the way to death as to a festival. She has quenched the fires of rebellion on her own soil without federal aid, and when the banners of nullification flew in the southern sky, speaking through the lips of Webster, in Faneuil Hall, she stood by Jackson and the Union. No man speaking in her name—no man wearing her ermine, or clothed with her authority—ever did anything, or said anything, or decided anything, not in accordance with her constitutional obligations. Yet, sir, the hand of the Federal Government has been laid heavily upon her.

That malignant spirit which has usurped this government through the negligence of the people, too long has pursued her with rancor and bitterness. Before its invidious legislation she has seen her commerce perish, and ruin,

* Speak nothing but good of the dead.

like a devastating fire, sweep through her fields of industry; but amid all these things Massachusetts has always lifted up her voice with unmurmuring devotion to the Union.

She has heard the federal drums in her streets. She has protected the person of that most odious man—odious both at the North and the South—the slave-hunter. She has protected him when her soil throbbed with indignation from the sea to the New York line. Sir, the temples of justice there have been clothed in chains. The federal courts in other states have been closed against her, and her citizens have been imprisoned, and she has had no redress.

Yet, notwithstanding all these things, Massachusetts has always been faithful and loyal to the Constitution. You may ask why, if she has been so wronged, so insulted, has she been so true and faithful to the Union? Sir, because she knew, in her clear head, that these outrages came not from the generous hearts of the American people. She knew that when justice should finally assume the reins of government all would be well. She knew when the government ceased to foster the interests of slavery alone, her interests would be regarded and the whole country be blessed. It was this high constitutional hope that has always swayed the head and heart of Massachusetts, and which has made her look out of the gloom of the present and anticipate a glorious future. So much in relation to the general charge against Massachusetts.

There are specific charges upon which I shall dwell for a moment. One is that she has organized an "Emigrant Aid Society." Did you not tell Massachusetts that the people of Kansas were to be left perfectly free to mold her institutions as they thought best? She knew, and she told you, that your doctrine of squatter sovereignty was a delusion and a snare. She opposed it as long as she could here; and when she could do it no longer she accepted the battle upon your pledge of fair play. She determined to make Kansas a free state.

In this high motive the Emigrant Aid Society had its origin. Its objects are twofold—freedom for Kansas and pecuniary reward. And it is so organized that pecuniary benefit cannot flow to stockholders, except through the prosperity of those whom it aids. The idea of the society

is this: to take capital and place it in advance of civilization; to take the elements of civilization, the sawmill, the church, the schoolhouse, and plant them in the wilderness, as an inducement to the emigrant. It is a peaceful society. It has never armed one man; it has never paid one man's passage to Kansas. It never asked—though I think it should have asked—the political sentiments of any man whom it has assisted to emigrate to Kansas. It has invested $100,000, and it has conducted from Massachusetts to Kansas some twelve to fifteen hundred of the flower of her people.

Such is the Emigrant Aid Society, such is its origin, and such its action. It is this society, so just and legal in its origin and its action, that has been made the pretext for the most bitter assaults upon Massachusetts. Sir, it is Christianity organized. How have these legal and these proper measures been met by those who propose to make Kansas a slave state? The people of Massachusetts would not complain if the people who differ from them should go there to seek a peaceful solution of the conflicting questions. But how have they been met? By fraud and violence, by sackings and burnings and murders.

Laws have been forced upon them, such as you have heard read to-day by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Colfax], so atrocious that no man has risen here to defend one single one of them. Men have been placed over them whom they never elected, and this day, as has been stated by the gentleman from Indiana, civil war rages from one end of Kansas to the other. Men have been compelled to leave their peaceful pursuits, and starvation and death stare them in the face, and yet the government stands idle—no, not idle; it gives its mighty arm to the side of the men who are trampling down law and order there.

The United States troops have not been permitted to protect the free state men. When they have desired to do so they have been withdrawn. I cannot enter into a detail of all the facts. It is a fact that war rages there to-day. Men kill each other at sight. All these things are known, and nobody can deny them. All the western winds are burdened with the news of them, and they are substantiated equally by both sides.

Has the government no power to make peace in Kansas and to protect citizens there under the organic law of the territory? I ask, in the name of old Massachusetts, if our honest citizens who went to Kansas to build up homes for themselves and to secure the blessings of civilization, are not entitled to protection? She throws the responsibility upon this administration, and holds it accountable; and so will the people at the polls next November.

Another charge is that Massachusetts has passed a personal liberty bill. Well, sir, I say that Massachusetts, for her local legislation, is not responsible to this House or to any member of it. I say, sir, if her laws were as bad as those atrocious laws of Kansas, you can do nothing with her. I say, if her statute books, instead of being filled with generous legislation—legislation which ought to be interesting to her assailants, because it is in favor of the idiotic and the blind—were filled, like those of the State of Alabama, with laws covering the state with whipping-posts, keeping half of her people in absolute slavery, and nearly all of the other half in subjection to twenty-nine thousand slaveholders; if the slaveholders themselves were not permitted to trade with or teach their slaves as they choose; if ignorance were increasing faster than the population, I say, even then, you could not do anything here with the local laws of Massachusetts. I say, the presumption is, that the law, having been passed by a sovereign state, is constitutional.

If it is not constitutional, then, sir, when the proper tribunal shall have decided that question, what is there, I ask, in the history of Massachusetts which will lead us to believe that she will not abide by that result? I say there is nothing in the history of the State of Mississippi, or of South Carolina, early or recent, which makes Massachusetts desirous of emulating their example. I, sir, agree with the South Carolina authority I have quoted here in regard to the legislation of Massachusetts.

Sir, my time is passing away and I must hasten on. The State of Massachusetts is the guardian of the rights of her citizens and of the inhabitants within her border line. If her citizens go beyond the line into distant lands, or upon the ocean, then they look to the federal arm for protection.

But old Massachusetts is the state which is to secure to her citizens the inestimable blessing of trial by jury and the writ of habeas corpus.

All these things must come from her and not from the Federal Government. I believe, with her great statesmen and with her people, that the Fugitive Slave Law is unconstitutional. Mr. Webster, as an original question, thought it was not constitutional; Mr. Rantoul, a brilliant statesman of Massachusetts, said the same thing; they both thought that the clause of the Constitution was addressed to the states. Mr. Webster bowed to the decision of the Supreme Court in the Prigg case; Mr. Rantoul did not.

Massachusetts believes it to be unconstitutional; but whether it be constitutional or not, she means, so long as the Federal Government undertakes to execute that law, that the Federal Government shall do it with its own instruments, vile or otherwise. She says that no one clothed with her authority shall do anything to help in it so long as the Federal Government undertakes to do it. But, sir, I pass from this.

I did intend to reply seriatim to all the attacks which have been made upon the state, but I have not half time enough. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Bennett], after enumerating a great many things he desired Massachusetts to do, said, amongst other things, that she must tear out of her statute book this personal liberty law. When she had done that and a variety of other things too numerous to mention, then, he said, "the South would forgive Massachusetts." The South forgive Massachusetts! Sir, forgiveness is an attribute of divinity. The South has it not. Sir, forgiveness is a higher quality than justice, even. The South—I mean the slave power—cannot comprehend it.

Sir, Massachusetts has already forgiven the South too many debts and too many insults. If we should do all the things the gentleman from Mississippi desired us to do, then the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Shorter] comes in and insists that Massachusetts shall do a great variety of other things before the South probably will forgive her.

Among other things, he desired that Massachusetts should blot out the fact that General Hull, who surrendered

Detroit, had his home in Massachusetts. Why, no, sir; she does not desire even to do that, for then she would have to blot out the fact that his gallant son had his home there—that gallant son who fell fighting for his country in the same war at Lundy's Lane—that great battle, where Colonel Miller, a Massachusetts man by adoption, when asked if he could storm certain heights, replied, in a modest Massachusetts manner, "I will try, sir." He stormed the heights.

The gentleman desires, also, that we should blot out the history of the connection of Massachusetts with the last war. Oh, no! She cannot do that. She cannot so dim the luster of the American arms. She cannot so wrong the republic. Where, then, would be your great sea fights? Where, then, would be the glory of "Old Ironsides," whose scuppers ran red with Massachusetts blood? Where, then, would be the history of the daring of those brave fishermen, who swarmed from all her bays and all her ports, sweeping the enemy's commerce from the most distant seas?

Ah, sir! she cannot afford to blot out that history. You, sir, cannot afford to let her do it—no, not even the South. She sustained herself in the last war; she paid her own expenses, and has not yet been paid entirely from the treasury of the nation. The enemy hovered on her coast with his ships, as numerous almost as the stars. He looked on that warlike land, and the memory of the olden time came back upon him. He remembered how, more than forty years before, he had trodden on that soil; he remembered how vauntingly he invaded it and how speedily he left it. He turned his glasses toward it and beheld its people rushing from the mountains to the sea to defend it; and he dared not attack it. Its capital stood in the salt sea spray, yet he could not take it. He sailed south, where there was another capital, not far from where we now stand, forty miles from the sea. A few staggering, worn-out sailors and soldiers came here. They took it. How it was defended let the heroes of Bladensburg answer!

Sir, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Keitt] made a speech; and if I may be allowed to coin a word, I will say it had more cantankerosity in it than any speech I ever heard on this floor.

It was certainly very eloquent in some portions—very eloquent, indeed; for the gentleman has indisputably an eloquent utterance and an eloquent temperament. I do not wish to criticise it much, but it opens in the most extraordinary manner with a "weird torchlight," and then he introduces a dead man, and then he galvanizes him, and puts him in that chair, and then he makes him "point his cold finger" around this hall.

Why, it almost frightens me to allude to it. And then he turns it into a theater, and then he changes or transmogrifies the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Colfax], who has just spoken, into a snake, and makes him "wriggle up to the footlights"; and then he gives the snake hands, and then "mailed hands," and with one of them he throws off Cuba, and with the other clutches all the Canadas. Then he has men with "glozing mouths," and they are "singing psalms through their noses," and are moving down upon the South "like an army with banners." Frightful, is it not? He talks about rotting or dead seas. He calls our party at one time a "toad," and then he calls it a "lizard"; "and more, which e'en to mention would be unlawful." Sir, his rhetoric seems to have the St. Vitus's dance. He mingles metaphors in such a manner as would delight the most extravagant Milesian.

But I pass from his logic and his rhetoric, and also over some historical mistakes, much of the same nature as those made by the President, which I have already pointed out, and come to some of his sentences, in which terrific questions and answers explode. He answers hotly and tauntingly that the South wants none of our vagabond philanthropy. Sir, when the yellow pestilence fluttered its wings over the Southern States, and when Massachusetts poured out her treasures to a greater extent in proportion to her population than any other state, was that vagabond philanthropy? I ask the people of Virginia and Louisiana.

But, sir, the gentleman was most tender and most plaintive when he described the starving operatives. Why, sir, the eloquence was most overwhelming upon some of my colleagues. I thought I saw the iron face of our speaker soften a little when he listened to the unexpected sympathy of the gentleman with the hardships of his early life. Sir,

he was an operative from boyhood to manhood—and a good one, too.

Ah, sir, he did not appreciate, as he tasted the sweet bread of honest toil, his sad condition; he did not think, as he stood in the music of the machinery which came from his cunning hand, how much better it would have been for him had he been born a slave and put under the gentleman from South Carolina—a kind master, as I have no doubt he is—where he would have been well fed and clothed, and would have known none of the trials which doubtless met him on every hand. How happy he would have been if, instead of being a Massachusetts operative, he had been a slave in South Carolina, fattening, singing, and dancing upon the banks of some Southern river.

Sir, if the gentleman will go to my district and look upon those operatives and mechanics; if he will look upon some of those beautiful models which come from their brains and hands, and which from time to time leap upon the waters of the Atlantic, out-flying all other clippers, bringing home wealth and victory with all the winds of heaven, he might have reason to change his views. Let him go there, and, even after all is said, he may speak to those men and convince them, if he can, of their starving condition. I will guarantee his personal safety. I believe the people of Massachusetts would pour forth their heart's blood to protect even him in the right of freedom of speech; and that is saying a great deal, after all that has happened.

Let him go to the great county of Worcester—that bee-hive of operatives and Abolitionists, as it has been called—and he will find the annual product of that county greater, in proportion to the population, than that of any other equal population in the world, as will be found by reference to a recent speech of ex-Governor Boutwell of our state. The next county, I believe, in respect to the amount of products in proportion to population, is away up in Vermont.

Sir, let him go and look at these men—these Abolitionists, who, we are told, meddle with everybody's business but their own. They certainly take time enough to attend to their own business to accomplish these results which I have named.

The gentleman broke out in an exceedingly explosive question, something like this—I do not know if my memory can do justice to the language of the gentleman, but it was something like this: "Did not the South, equally with the North, bare her forehead to the god of battles?" I answer plainly, No, sir, she did not; she did not.

Sir, Massachusetts furnished more men in the Revolution than the whole South put together, and more by tenfold than South Carolina. I am not including, of course, the militia—the conjectured militia furnished by that state. There is no proof that they were ever engaged in any battle. I mean the regulars; and I say that Massachusetts furnished more than ten times as many men as South Carolina. I say on the authority of a standard historian, once a member of this House [Mr. Sabine, in his "History of the Loyalists"], that more New England men now lie buried in the soil of South Carolina than there were of South Carolinians who left their state to fight the battles of the country.

I say, when General Lincoln was defending Charleston he was compelled to give up his defense because the people of that city would not fight. When General Greene, that Rhode Island blacksmith, took command of the Southern army, South Carolina had not a federal soldier in the field; and the people of that state would not furnish supplies to his army; while the British army in the state were furnished with supplies almost exclusively from the people of South Carolina. While the American army could not be recruited, the ranks of the British army were rapidly filled from that state.

The British post of Ninety-Six was garrisoned almost exclusively from South Carolina. Rawdon's reserve corps was made up almost entirely by South Carolinians. Of the eight hundred prisoners who were taken at the battle of King's Mountain—of which we have heard so much—seven hundred of them were Southern Tories. The Maryland men gained the laurels of the Cowpens. Kentuckians, Virginians, and North Carolinians gained the battle of King's Mountain. Few South Carolinians fought in the battles of Eutaw, Guilford, etc. They were chiefly fought by men out of South Carolina; and they would have won greater fame and brighter laurels if they had not been opposed

chiefly by the citizens of the soil. Well might the British commander boast that he had reduced South Carolina into allegiance.

But, sir, I will not proceed further with this history, out of regard for the fame of our common country; out of regard for the patriots—the Sumters, the Marions, the Rutledges, the Pinkneys, the Haynes—truer patriots, if possible, than those of any other state.

Out of regard for these men I will not quote from a letter of the patriot Governor Mathews to General Greene, in which he complains of the selfishness and utter imbecility of a great portion of the people of South Carolina.

But, Mr. Chairman, all these assaults upon the State of Massachusetts sink into insignificance compared with the one I am about to mention. On the nineteenth of May it was announced that Mr. Sumner would address the Senate upon the Kansas question. The floor of the Senate, the galleries, and avenues leading thereto, were thronged with an expectant audience; and many of us left our places in this House to hear the Massachusetts orator. To say that we were delighted with the speech we heard would but faintly express the deep emotions of our hearts awakened by it. I need not speak of the classic purity of its language, nor of the nobility of its sentiments. It was heard by many; it has been read by millions. There has been no such speech made in the Senate since the days when those Titans of American eloquence—the Websters and the Haynes—contended with each other for mastery.

It was severe, because it was launched against tyranny. It was severe as Chatham was severe when he defended the feeble colonies against the giant oppression of the mother country. It was made in the face of a hostile Senate. It continued through the greater portion of two days; and yet during that time the speaker was not once called to order. This fact is conclusive as to the personal and parliamentary decorum of the speech. He had provocation enough. His state had been called hypocritical. He himself had been called "a puppy," "a fool," "a fanatic," and "a dishonest man." Yet he was parliamentary from the beginning to the end of his speech. No man knew better than he did the proprieties of the place, for he had always observed

them. No man knew better than he did parliamentary law, because he had made it the study of his life. No man saw more clearly than he did the flaming sword of the Constitution, turning every way, guarding all the avenues of the Senate. But he was not thinking of these things; he was not thinking then of the privileges of the Senate nor of the guaranties of the Constitution; he was there to denounce tyranny and crime, and he did it. He was there to speak for the rights of an empire, and he did it bravely and grandly.

So much for the occasion of the speech. A word, and I shall be pardoned, about the speaker himself. He is my friend; for many and many a year I have looked to him for guidance and light, and I never looked in vain. He never had a personal enemy in his life; his character is as pure as the snow that falls on his native hills; his heart overflows with kindness for every being having the upright form of man; he is a ripe scholar, a chivalric gentleman, and a warm-hearted, true friend. He sat at the feet of Channing, and drank in the sentiments of that noble soul. He bathed in the learning and undying love of the great jurist, Story; and the hand of Jackson, with its honors and its offices, sought him early in life, but he shrank from them with instinctive modesty. Sir, he is the pride of Massachusetts. His mother commonwealth found him adorning the highest walks of literature and law, and she bade him go and grace somewhat the rough character of political life. The people of Massachusetts—the old, and the young, and the middle-aged—now pay their full homage to the beauty of his public and private character. Such is Charles Sumner.

On the twenty-second day of May, when the Senate and the House had clothed themselves in mourning for a brother fallen in the battle of life in the distant State of Missouri, the senator from Massachusetts sat in the silence of the Senate chamber, engaged in the employments appertaining to his office, when a member from this House, who had taken an oath to sustain the Constitution, stole into the Senate, that place which had hitherto been held sacred against violence, and smote him as Cain smote his brother.

One blow was enough; but it did not satiate the wrath of that spirit which had pursued him through two days.

Again and again, quicker and faster fell the leaden blows, until he was torn away from his victim, when the senator from Massachusetts fell in the arms of his friends, and his blood ran down on the Senate floor. Sir, the act was brief, and my comments on it shall be brief also. I denounce it in the name of the Constitution it violated. I denounce it in the name of the sovereignty of Massachusetts, which was stricken down by the blow. I denounce it in the name of civilization, which it outraged. I denounce it in the name of humanity. I denounce it in the name of that fair play which bullies and prize-fighters respect. What! strike a man when he is pinioned—when he cannot respond to a blow! Call you that chivalry? In what code of honor did you get your authority for that? I do not believe that member has a friend so dear who must not in his heart of hearts condemn the act. Even the member himself, if he has left a spark of that chivalry and gallantry attributed to him, must loathe and scorn the act. God knows, I do not wish to speak unkindly or in a spirit of revenge; but I owe it to my manhood and the noble state I in part represent, to express my deep abhorrence of the act.

Sir, the sons of Massachusetts are educated at the knees of their mothers in the doctrines of peace and good-will, and God knows they desire to cultivate those feelings—feelings of social kindness and public kindness. The House will bear witness that we have not violated or trespassed upon any of them; but, sir, if we are pushed too long or too far, there are men from the old commonwealth of Massachusetts who will not shrink from a defense of freedom of speech, and the honored state they represent, on any field where they may be assailed.

NOV 72


39353003161617